

Whitman & Co.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

N^o. CXCIV.
FOURTH SERIES.—No. LXXIV.
MARCH, 1856.

BOSTON.
CROSBY, NICHOLS, AND COMPANY.

NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO.

LONDON: EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178 STRAND.

1856.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

REV. GEORGE PUTNAM, of Roxbury, - - - - - } *Editors.*
REV. GEORGE E. ELLIS, of Charlestown, - - - - - }

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS,
GENERAL AGENTS
FOR ALL PERIODICALS, AMERICAN AND FOREIGN,
111 Washington Street,
BOSTON.

C., N., & CO. ARE PUBLISHERS OF
THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,
QUARTERLY, AT FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
BI-MONTHLY, AT FOUR DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE LAW REPORTER,
MONTHLY, AT THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.
Import FOREIGN BOOKS to order by every Steamer.

Persons leaving their names with us can be furnished with the late
LONDON CATALOGUES AS ISSUED.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
111 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
<p>I. DR. BUSHNELL ON "THE CHRISTIAN TRINITY A PRACTICAL TRUTH"</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The New-Englander, November, 1854. New Haven. Article on "The Christian Trinity a Practical Truth."</p>	161
<p>II. THE RABBINICAL DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE . . .</p>	189
<p>III. UNITARIANISM AND ORTHODOXY ON THE NATURE AND THE STATE OF MAN</p>	203
<p>IV. POETRY</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">1. Christ in the Flesh. 2. The Discovery.</p>	246
<p>V. BROOKS'S HISTORY OF MEDFORD</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">History of the Town of Medford, Middlesex County, Massachusetts, from its First Settlement in 1630, to the Present Time, 1855. By Charles Brooks.</p>	248
<p>VI. REFLECTIONS</p>	266
<p>VII. PRESCOTT'S REIGN OF PHILIP THE SECOND</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain. By William H. Prescott.</p>	274
<p>NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.</p>	
Dr. Sheldon's Sermons on Sin and Redemption . . .	296
May's Mortimer's College Life	300
Caird's Religion in Common Life	302
Mrs. Dorr's Lanmere	303
Blakeman on the Soul between Death and the Resurrection	303
Hillard's Selections from Landor	304
Dr. Harris's Patriarchy, or the Family	305
Thompson's Christian Theism	305
Irving's Life of Washington	306

Hillard's First-Class Reader	307
Duykinck's Cyclopædia of American Literature	308
Cary's Memoir of T. H. Perkins	309
Simmons's Six Sermons	310
Mrs. Zornlin's Physical Geography	311
Dr. Lowell's Occasional Sermons	312
Dr. Adams's Communion Sabbath	313
Miss Hunt's Glances and Glimpses	314

INTELLIGENCE.

<i>Literary Intelligence</i>	315
--	-----

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MARCH, 1856.

ART. I. — DR. BUSHNELL ON "THE CHRISTIAN TRINITY
A PRACTICAL TRUTH." *

THE subject which has been introduced to public attention, under the above title, in an article by a distinguished clergyman of a neighboring State, and which solicits that attention in terms so courteous and catholic, we venture here to take up; but not for disputatious controversy. The subject is too vast and awful for this. When we attempt to investigate the mode of the Divine existence, as far as it is comprehensible by finite minds, or to adjust the relations of those entities represented by the names Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is not in that dogmatic temper which feels that it has a side to maintain that the task is to be approached, but rather in that reserved, sedate, reverent, God-seeking spirit, which humbly aspires to know the grandest of truths, to be instructed in the profoundest of mysteries. It gives us pleasure to acknowledge the controlling presence of such a spirit in the article before us, as well as generally in the writings of its author. If his reasonings fail to satisfy us, we admire the candor as well as earnestness with which they are conducted. If we cannot agree in his conclu-

* *The New-Englander*, November, 1854. New Haven. Article on "The Christian Trinity a Practical Truth."

sions, we can heartily commend both the sincerity and the ability of his endeavors.

And yet we must be allowed to say, in the outset, that Dr. Bushnell exhibits less of logical accuracy than of the skill of the rhetorician, in arranging the materials for his argument. If he does not precisely "beg the question," he lays his foundation with postulates wholly inadmissible by those whom he seeks to convince. For example, the subject in hand is the *practical importance of the Trinity*; but the object evidently is to convince those who do not receive this doctrine that it is a truth of Christianity. Now this fundamental point he assumes as the basis of his reasoning. He begins by asserting that

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, when we look to find him offering what is most of all practical and distinctive in his Gospel, most necessary in that view to its power in the earth, *advances just the Christian Trinity, and nothing else.*" (!)

Again, after quoting the direction of Jesus to his Apostles to baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," he asks :—

"What then does it mean, that Christ himself, the simplest and most practical, and, in the highest sense, most rational of teachers, in a parting charge to his disciples, gives them not any truth or vestige of truth over and above this one difficult, ever to be contested, *formula of Trinity?*"

And again :—

"As we pause upon it and ponder it a little more deeply, we begin to suspect that this *formula of Trinity* is given simply because *it is the Gospel* in its most condensed form of statement. . . . In some deeper sense of it open to him, the Trinity, as we are thus left to understand, is the underlying truth and contains the whole working matter of his Gospel."

The material thing above asserted is, that the Trinity was left by Jesus as an essential part of his religion. It was of much consequence to be able to carry the force of this assumption into the modified proposition Dr. Bushnell chooses to maintain. There is all the difference in the world between saying, "The Trinity is a subject of great practical importance," and, "The Trinity is a *truth of Christianity* of great practical importance." The former is, ostensibly, the proposition of Dr. Bushnell ;

but he so disposes the preliminaries of his argument as to give to it all the meaning and weight of the latter ; and thus, while proving the less, to which alone he addresses himself, he would secure the advantage of having demonstrated the greater, — a far more difficult, not to say impossible, task.

Having thus laid the foundation, Dr. Bushnell proceeds to state the case as follows : —

“ An issue is thus made up, it will be seen, between the ascending Redeemer on one side, and a very general sentiment or opinion of the Christian world on the other, regarding the practical import of the Christian Trinity. On the side last named, it is very commonly asserted that it has no practical value, and is only a kind of scholastic futility, which, if we do not reject, we receive as a faith wholly inoperative and useless. On the side of the Son of God himself, it is assumed to be, in fact, a condensed expression for all that is operative and powerful in the Christian faith.”

This is the issue which Dr. Bushnell has chosen to make up for argument. We quite agree with him when he says, that, “ Protected by so great a name [the name of Christ], it requires no courage in us to venture some considerations from our human point of view that may go to illustrate the intense practical significance of this great truth.” But did Dr. Bushnell think to ask himself, who would have the temerity to oppose him, who would venture championship of the other side, with the great name of Jesus Christ confronting him ? For ourselves, we decline it altogether. *We* have not “ courage ” enough. If Christ taught the Trinity, with us there is no longer an open question. It is an important practical truth, of course. Every truth is important practically. It may be a worthy effort to show the particular mode of its practical working, — and this Dr. Bushnell has done well to undertake ; but the main point is conceded at once. We therefore can accept no such issue as that which is thus tendered. The real issue embraces both what is assumed and what is attempted to be proved. For our own part, we have no difficulty with the Trinity which might not easily be overcome if we were satisfied that it is a truth of Christianity. This is the chief laboring point in our mind. Now this difficulty is not relieved by any number of assumptions or assertions. When

Dr. Bushnell calls the formula of Baptism recorded in Matthew "the formula of *Trinity*," our eyes are not thereby opened to see Trinity in that formula. The formula has the hearty assent of our faith. It is the loftiest utterance ever heard on earth. It comprehends all religious truth. The mind instinctively bows before it as containing "the whole working matter of the Gospel." We fully agree with Dr. Bushnell that "it is the Gospel in its most condensed form of statement." It is the resplendent inscription over the door through which the Church of the First-born is entered, — "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost!" But what authority for comprehending these under one barbarous name? Why blend the Sacred Three in a unity which confounds all real distinction? Why this interpolation of "*Trinity*"? The term expresses no idea contained in the formula. Indeed, the words of the formula seem to us to exclude the idea of Trinity. Suppose that, instead of the august names Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the formula had stood thus: "Baptizing them in the name of the Creator, and of the Redeemer, and of the Sanctifier." Would Dr. Bushnell have inferred that these three were one, and to be worshipped under the common name of God; and would he have called this the "*formula of Trinity*"? Does not every mind perceive at once that each of these has qualities and offices distinct from the others, constituting them separate entities, and that it is by a figure only that they could be called one? It surely would not be deemed unreasonable, upon any just interpretation of the terms, to affirm that of the three the Creator only is God, — the Original of all, the Underived; and that the other two, whatever their power and office, and however near to the Throne their place, being derived from the First, are not to be worshipped as God. But these substituted terms, if they do not exhaust the meaning of those in the actual formula, indicate their true import, and also the relation in which the Sacred Three stand to each other. And surely no one ignorant of our polemics, finding them there, would derive from their intrinsic sense authority to pronounce the three co-equal and co-eternal, or to compound a word, unknown to the oracles of God, which should represent them as though they were but one being. Leave them, we say, each in his own glory.

Do not confound them in the barbarism of Trinity. Let the Father be Father, and the Son be Son, and the Spirit be Spirit, for ever.

Respecting the proper object of Christian worship, we only observe here, that if the Apostles, at the moment of receiving their commission from Christ, had fallen down in his presence and exclaimed, "O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons in one God!" or, "O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity! accept our worship," — we have no manner of question they would have been forbidden, as John was in Patmos when he fell down to worship the Voice that came out of the Throne: "See thou do it not. Worship God." For this would be in accordance with what he afterwards said to them: "Go to my *brethren*, and say unto them, I ascend unto *my* Father and *your* Father, and to *my* God and *your* God," — clearly implying, that he and they had a common spiritual origin and a common dependence, and therefore a common object of worship.

We advance one step farther with our friend in the preliminary part of his argument. As there have been many forms of Trinity, it was incumbent on him to define, or at least to indicate, that view of it, the practical uses of which he would set forth. "Not every Trinity that has been believed in is practical." "Indeed, conceptions of this great truth are held by many which are so far abhorrent from its proper simplicity, and so badly distorted by the perverse ingenuity of human speculation, as to oppose hinderances to the practical repose of faith, and even to counteract in a great degree the real benefit of the doctrine." What then is the form of Trinity held by Dr. Bushnell? He would forgive our countenance, we are sure, if it should smile at the assumption expressed in the answer. "We undertake," he says, "to show the practical value of the *Christian* Trinity, or Trinity of the Christian Scriptures." Well, what is that? It is admitted that the Scriptures offer no theoretic or scientific statement of the doctrine whatever. It is further admitted that they assume the strict unity and simplicity of God, that he is one substance or entity, only one. But it is maintained that they also assume that this "One will at least be most effectively thought as three, a threefold grammatic personality, or

three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." If we understand this statement, it means simply this: that, although in the Divine nature, regarded ontologically, there is no Trinity, but strictest unity, yet, because it is more easy to think of God as three than as one, therefore the Scriptures so represent him to us. "The three are not even called *persons*, but are only set in the *grammar of uses* silently as such." In other words, it is allowed us for practical purposes to consider them as persons, although they are, in fact, such only in some tropical or instrumental sense. The Trinity is thus held — we hope we do no injustice to the thought — as a matter of *form* or *language* accommodated to our finite wants and uses. It is true Dr. Bushnell speaks of "ascending to a point more interior, and to higher apprehensions of the subject; namely, to the discovery of something more interior, as a ground in the eternity of God, antecedent to the revelation in time." But when he has reached this point, does he find anything to his purpose? Or, like St. Paul returning from his rapture, is he unable to describe what he sees? To our apprehension, he advances not a step beyond his original position, which, assuming the strict unity and the infinity of God, declares that Trinity is needed "as a way of conceiving him and working our piety towards him"; permitted us, therefore, we may suppose, if not for the hardness of our hearts, yet for the blindness of our minds.

It would be less a matter of wonder that a metaphysician, like Dr. Bushnell, should have drawn from the capacious storehouse of his imagination the form of such a Trinity, if there were the slightest demand for it in the necessities of faith, or a ray of evidence to support it in the Scriptures. This is not the place to go into the question of Scriptural authority, yet we cannot dismiss the matter, even for a moment, without asserting strongly our conviction, that the Bible nowhere presents God to us as *three* even in form or language, but, on the contrary, is explicit in setting him forth as simply, strictly, and only *one*; variously manifested indeed, — in creation and providence as the All-powerful, in Christ as the All-merciful, in the Spirit as the All-holy, — but in himself one undivided essence of infinite perfection, the

Source of all other existence, the Original of all other intelligence and life.

The supposed necessity for a *representative* Trinity arises from the difficulty of conceiving the abstract nature of God. It belongs wholly to the speculative reason, which is for ever inventing schemes, to explain what its imperfection prevents it from seeing clearly. We are sorry to see a thinker like Dr. Bushnell, for whom we have so sincere respect, first losing himself in the maze of transcendental refinements concerning the Absolute Being, and then trying to find his way out by the scheme of Trinity, which is equally bewildering. Such refinements are always dangerous. Commonly they end in Atheism. The Stratos and Anaximanders, the Holbachs and Spinozas, whose philosophy leaves the world without a sustainer, are separated only by a narrow strait from those whose faith clings to God, but whose reasonings result in the denial of his personality. A non-personal God is really *no* God. The idea of personality is fundamental in all just conceptions of him. Indeed, it is essential to any conception of him whatever. There is no God possible to human thought without it. Pantheism is but another name for no-theism. Yet Dr. Bushnell is led, by the course of his speculations concerning the abstract nature of the Divine Being, to bring into doubt his personality. And he does this on grounds of which we cannot feel the force at all.

"God is not a person," he says, "save in a figure, as we shall see at a glance if we ask what constitutes our idea of a person. This we shall readily answer out of our own consciousness. What is a person, as we conceive the term, drawing on our own consciousness? A person is one who wills, putting forth successively new determinations of will, without which new determinations personality is null, and no agency at all. But God never does that: his determinations are all passed even from eternity. So a person thinks; or has successions of thought coming in as it were in file one after another. God never thinks in any such sense. As all his acts are done, so all his thoughts are present contemporaneously from eternity. Literally God is not a person; for the very word is finite in all its measures and implications; because it is derived from ourselves."

Trinitarians have usually labored to convince us that

God is *three* persons, but here it is attempted to show that he is *no* person at all. This is the conclusion of a process of subtile reasoning, the links of which lie hid in clouds of abstraction. The Scriptures teach that "God made man in his own image." If man is the image of God, then God resembles man. But in what respects? Dr. Bushnell says, not in *willing*, not in *thinking*, not in *reasoning*, not in *remembering*. These are all acts of a self-conscious intelligence; and if not in these, wherein consists the resemblance? We answer, In the fact that each — God and man — is a self-conscious intelligence. The acts of such an intelligence do not constitute his being. The modes by which he manifests his powers are no part of his essence. Behind all processes of the mind is the mind itself, the self-conscious person, the ME. The processes of our mind may be altogether unlike those of the Infinite Mind, and still between the two minds there may be resemblance. Man is a being of five senses. But suppose one had neither of these, — suppose a child should be born of human parents without either of the five senses, would he be less a *person*? Starting from our own consciousness, it surely is not necessary to imagine him possessed of these senses in order to conceive of him as a person. Suppose a man should appear so singularly endowed, that by *one* act of thought or of will he could decide everything in regard to himself for his whole future! A very strange being this would be, undoubtedly; but should we hesitate to call him a *person*? Or, suppose one should appear with a sixth sense, by virtue of which he could look straight into heaven and see the white throne and him that sits thereon; should we deny personality to him because our experience gives us knowledge of only five senses? To every self-conscious being every other such being, whatever his powers, and whether man, angel, or God, is a person. Whether God wills after the manner of men or not, whether there be or be not succession of thoughts in his mind, whether he reasons and remembers or not, (concerning which no one can either affirm or deny,) being a self-conscious intelligence, though with will and thought and reason infinite, he is a PERSON. Personality is not a metaphysical conception. It is the assertion of a primitive fact of consciousness. The word is a figure

only, as all language is figurative. It has one universal meaning, and is applied by all men to themselves and to all other beings of kindred, however superior, powers. It is incapable of definition, because itself the simplest form in which the fact can be expressed. The moment it is denied to God, the Eternal himself is driven from the mind, and the link which unites the soul with its author is broken and cast away. If he is not a person in a sense analogous to that in which man is a person, then what is he to us but that immense platitude, half impersonated to the imagination to give it the semblance of reality, which pantheism baptizes and educates under the name of The All, but which it might as well worship as The Nothing?

Now we know of no one who would shrink from this result with more dread, than the author of the pages we are reviewing. No man is more reverent towards God. His profound love of truth, his deep and sincere faith, his catholic Christian piety, it would be a libel to call in question. But his strong desire to show a real want in the religious mind for the Trinity he has adopted, has carried him too far in this direction. Dr. Bushnell combines the qualities of a poet, a dialectician, and a mystic; and these make him a theorist, enthusiastic but not always quite clear; often original but also liable to be extravagant. The following sentences may illustrate what we mean. It is first affirmed that "literally God is not a person."

"We do not remember ever to have seen the fact noticed," (the idea is original,) "but we do exactly the same thing, as regards truth or intelligent comprehension, when we say that God is a person, that we do when we say that he is three persons, and there is really no difficulty in one case that does not exist in the other. As we can say that God is a person without any denial of his infinity, so we can say that he is three persons without any breach of his unity. Indeed, we shall hereafter see that he is set forth, and needs to be, as three persons, for the very purpose, in part, of mending a difficulty created by asserting that he is one person; that is, to save the impression of his infinity. The word person is *in either case a figure*, and as truly in one as in the other. And if the question be raised, what correspondent reality there is in the divine nature to meet and justify the figure, there can plainly be no literal correspondence between the infinite substance of God and any merely finite term, whether

one or three ; or, if we suppose a correspondence undefinable and tropical, it may as well answer to three persons as one."

An analysis of this passage gives the following result : 1. God is not a person. 2. It is just as true that he is three persons as that he is one. 3. We can *say* that God is a person without any breach of his infinity ; and we can *say* that he is three persons without any breach of his unity. 4. He is set forth as three persons to save the impression of his infinity. 5. God is in reality neither one nor three. 6. Or if he is, he is just as much one as the other. We must be excused for still thinking that the simple declaration, "The Lord our God is ONE Lord," is more satisfactory than the substitute, "The Lord our God is a THREEFOLD Lord."

We advance now to the main points of the argument ; the first of which is, that Trinity is needed "*to save the dimensions or the practical infinity of God consistently with his personality.*" In order to a just idea of God, it is necessary to conceive of him as a being really infinite and at the same time as existing in terms of mutual relation with man. But this twofold conception can be fully attained, it is argued, only by help of that form which Trinity gives to our idea of God. Departing from Trinity, the mind comes on one side to Pantheism. God is the All. His infinity is saved, but his personal relation to man is lost. Personality is merged in boundlessness. On the other side we come to Unitarianism, which represents God as a personal being and as one person. This saves the relational state altogether. God is a person, a Father eternal, creating and ruling the worlds and doing all things for the benefit of his children. But in thus bringing him under the conditions of personality, we limit him ; the boundless dimensions are lost, his infinity is practically taken away. The one God, the great Father whom Unitarianism sets forth, contrary to all its preconceptions, becomes a name without magnitude or any genuine power of impression. The figure of a one personality, and seeing God always under that figure, drags him down by the force of its finite associations. This conception and worship of him as One Person, which is nothing but a metaphysically finite conception, while gaining one point, the reciprocal relationship, parts with everything necessary to the grandeur, the transcendent wonder, the immeasurable vastness, of God.

This difficulty is obviated, it is thought, by giving to the Divine personality a less restricted character, — by *threeing* it, — or by supposing it to pass freely from Father to Son, and from Son to Spirit, without being confined to either. Thinking of him as Father, we preserve the relational feeling, which, however, limits his infinity. It is therefore necessary to pass in thought from Father to Son, and from Son to Spirit, confining the mind to neither, in order to escape from this limitation, and, at the same time, not to lose the feeling which is held by it. "In this way the mind is thrown into a maze," Dr. Bushnell says, "of *sublimity*." We should omit the last two words if we were to express our own view of it.

We have but little time to spend on this part of the argument. The difficulties suggested in it, we apprehend, are wholly imaginary. No Unitarian, we venture to say, has ever felt that his conception of the infinity of God was straitened or confined by that of his single personality. Besides, the idea of three persons is just as much a limitation as that of one. Indeed, it is more so. The idea of one may dilate to the infinite breadth of the heavens; but the idea of three supposes that one shall leave room for another. Each limits the other two. But, as we have said, the difficulty is purely imaginary. The sense of God's infinity will take care of itself. It spurns all limitations, and will not be held by them. Heathenism tried to cramp it by distributing the attributes of the One amongst a multitude of inferior deities. But in vain. Over all these gods of the nations it soared into the everlasting heights, spreading itself out to the amplitude of the universe, and above the mightiest and the cunningest of the many still enthroned the One. To say that there is something grander, higher in majesty, "heavier on the soul's feeling," in the conception of God as existing in three persons, than in that of a single personality, is contrary to all the analogies of the case. Moral force the more it is concentrated becomes the more august. All the spiritual power in the universe brought together in one mass would be far more awful and heavy on the soul's feeling than it is in its diffusion. The bringing of three persons as God before the mind serves only to confuse thought and to prevent that concentration of the soul's powers on a single object of worship which it

seems to have been a leading design of revelation to effect. Besides, where do we find the loftiest conceptions of God's infinity expressed in human speech. Where is the majestic and awful grandeur of the Divine nature set forth in terms of impressiveness and sublimity such as no language of ours can equal? Where do Trinitarians find words in which to utter their profoundest sense of the transcendent and unapproachable glory of "the High and Holy One"? We answer, In the scriptures of men who believed in and taught the simple unity of God. Not in Heathen poets who sung a multifold personality, but in Hebrew prophets who adored the One Living and True, and who never gave the remotest hint that this God existed in three persons.

Our Saviour said, "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven!" He did not fear the limitation of the infinity of God, which Dr. Bushnell dreads, by the use of this blessed name. When he himself, addressing the Deity, said: "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth," — does any one suppose that he included himself in the Object of that ascription? or that he needed the other terms, "Son" and "Holy Spirit," to keep the conception of Father from degenerating in his mind into that of a limited Divinity? or that this was a "name" to him "without magnitude or any genuine power of impression"? or that the Trinitarian God would have been to him "more a God, higher in majesty and heavier on the soul's feeling"? These are questions which admit of but one answer, that in itself is the highest sanction of the theology Dr. Bushnell characterizes as "a cold and feeble monotheism!"

The second point in Dr. Bushnell's view of the Trinity presents it as having a practical relation *to our character and our state as sinners. It is the instrument and co-efficient of a supernatural grace or redemptive economy.* Dr. Bushnell rejects the old notion of an infinite atonement. The Trinity is not needed in that view, but rather as answering to the twofold Divine economy, the one of nature, the other supernatural, which require, it is supposed, a twofold conception of God. If the universal economy included nothing but nature, — a realm of complete systematic causation symbolizing the regulative mind of God, — the single conception *God* would answer

all necessary uses. There would be no need of Trinity. In other words, nothing in nature, its laws, its operations, its mysteries, — nothing in the mind, regarded simply in its relations to nature, — requires the Trinity.

But the universal economy includes another department, namely, the *supernatural*. There is no provision in nature, it is contended, for redemption from sin. When the moral law is violated, all that nature does is to punish. "The penal train is a run of justice, and the run is downward even for ever; for it is inconceivable that disorder should ever beget order. Nothing but a force supernatural can restore the mischief." God's economy, then, must comprehend the two factors, — nature and the supernatural, — a kingdom of Nature and a kingdom of Grace. Now, being in a state of retributive disorder, to be recovered from it, related thus to God as the Head of the two economies, and having our salvation to seek under their joint action, how shall we be able to conceive God in any manner that will set him continually in this twofold relation towards us? There is no intellectual machinery, it is said, in a close theoretic monotheism, for any such thing as a work of Grace, or supernatural redemption. We should say, beforehand, that no such thing can ever be; for how can God rescue from his own causes, and open a way through his own retributions? If we have only the single term *God*, then we must speak of God as dealing with God, contending with the causations of God, the grace-force of God delivering from the nature-force of God. It is God sending God into the world; God within graciously mastering the retributive causations of God within. The Trinity gives us such a conception of God as exactly meets that higher and more comprehensive view of his kingdom in which it includes and harmonizes the two economies, nature and the supernatural. First we have the term Father, which sets him before us as the King of nature. Next we have the Son and the Spirit, which represent the supernatural; the Son coming into nature from above nature, incarnate in the person of Jesus, erecting a kingdom in the world that is not of the world; the Spirit coming in the power of the Son, to complete by an inward supernatural working what the Son began by the address he made without to human thought and the

forces he imported into nature by his doctrine, his works, his life, and his death.

Great problems, it will be seen, are opened here. The penal effects of sin, — the possibilities of human nature in the direction of self-recovery, — nature and grace, their agreement and difference, — the mediatorial office, — the relation of God through Christ to humanity, — these are some of the all-concerning questions which are propounded. They are questions of such a nature that all dogmatism in reference to them is sheer presumption. No one is less offensive in this particular than Dr. Bushnell. His theory is woven with so delicate a thread into a warp of clearly perceived truth, that it is difficult to distinguish it and view it by itself. Yet this needs to be done. The fallacy of the argument consists in assuming an apparent for a real fact. It is a convenience to thought, no doubt, to divide the operations of God, as man is affected by them, into two economies; yet it is evident that all are truly comprehended in one vast scheme, and that throughout the whole is felt the energy of one and the same Infinite Life. From the beginning, God has interpolated nothing into his plan. Nature is not one system, and grace another, contrived to make up its deficiencies. Grace is not a supplement of nature. It is as old as man. It breathed on Adam both before and after he fell. It opened his eyes to see the Lord God. It came down to him in the spirit of repentance, and strove with his soul shrinking from perdition. It wrote the Divine Name above the door of the patriarch's tent, and touched his heart in dreams which he could interpret only as whispers of angels. It kindled up the heavens with a spiritual glory before which the elder prophets stood in amazement, whilst they adored the Eternal Majesty it enshrined. It gave the Law to Moses, Tabernacle and Temple to Israel. Nay, it antedates all these; for before the foundations of the world were laid, the Lamb was slain, and every spiritual want of man provided for in the all-encircling economy of Him who is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Means have always been commensurate with exigencies. As sin increased, the Divine provision went on unfolding itself into new measures of grace, till it reached its fulness and consummation in the sorrows and agonies, in the amazements

and sublimities, of Calvary. The Love which shone in the face of Jesus Christ was in the beginning with God, and was God; and the mighty power which, through him, raised the dead, is the same that created the world. Man has never been without a Redeemer. "Before Abraham was, I am." The consequences of breaking the law moral never were irremediable. It is not true that "the penal train is a run of justice, and that the run is downward even for ever." The law which punishes also restores. As written in the Bible it stands, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," with this important proviso: "If it turn from the wickedness it hath committed, and do that which is lawful and right, it shall not die, but live." The proviso is a part of the law; its foundation from everlasting, in the nature of things; and its operation is commensurate with the universe and the eternity of God.

Conceiving Nature and Grace as two distinct economies, Dr. Bushnell thinks the simple term *God* not sufficient to express his relations as Head of both. Other terms are needed to fill up the space between, and harmonize the two. The two economies being in some respects antagonistic, and God being the Head of both, it becomes necessary to speak of God as "dealing with God, the grace-force of God contending with the nature-force of God." But we see not how the Trinity obviates this difficulty. For if the Father be God of nature and the Son God of grace, and if these are not two Gods, but one, we still have "God dealing with God, the grace-force of God contending with the nature-force of God."

Now *we* avoid the difficulty by denying the hypothesis from which it springs. In no sense are nature and the supernatural antagonistic. Both are parts of one stupendous whole, animated by one Life, controlled by one universal Law. There is no strife of opposite forces in the case; and therefore no need of two names to designate the Head of all. When one bows in love and adoration before Him who made the heavens and the earth, he is under no necessity of shifting his conceptions into another mould in order to worship in spirit and in truth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. When a poor sinner, stricken in heart by the conviction of his

guilt, desires to be cleansed and sanctified by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and for this end turns to Him who, being "almighty to create," is also "almighty to renew," he finds the single term FATHER comprehensive enough for all his needs. The machinery which Dr. Bushnell discovers in the terms of the Trinity, and thinks so well accommodated to our sin and the struggles of our faith, we find no use for. Indeed, it seems to us to thwart the very purpose which it is thought to subserve. We deny not the need of the terms "Son" and "Spirit" as representing instrumentalities whereby God will have all men to be saved, and to which faith clings as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The Christian cannot express his soul's wants or hopes without them. But not as members of a Trinity, which confounds the distinction between them and the true God, and so virtually leaves us without them, are they needed. Let them stand before us in such relations that we can really put "our trust in the Son as coming down from God, offering himself before God, going up to God, interceding before God, reigning with God, by him accepted, honored, glorified, and allowed to put all things under his feet"; and can invoke God also to send down the Spirit to be "the power of a real indwelling life, coursing through our nature, breathing health into its diseases, and so rolling back the penal currents of justice to set us free,"—let them stand thus as separate agents, each having its distinct office in the grand economy comprehending all spiritual forces, through which God is reconciling the world unto himself;—and then with each "how lively and full and blessed our converse will be, so pliant to our use as finite men, so gloriously accommodated to our state as sinners."

These two points, first, as *saving the practical infinity of God consistently with his personality*, second, as *the instrument and co-efficient of a supernatural grace or redemptive economy*, include the whole of the argument for the practical need, and consequent practical value, of the Trinity. Thus far no reference has been made to the interior mystery of the Divine nature. The argument amounts to nothing more than that God must needs be *exhibited* in this way, in order to the uses stated; that the three personalities, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, taken

simply as means of divine *representation*, are necessary to the adequate impression of God, and the practical uses of a supernatural and redemptive economy. We have endeavored to show, on the contrary, in the first place, that the terms by which God is represented in the Scriptures are sufficient, *without supposing a Trinity*, to fill out to the utmost our conception of his infinity, and, at the same time, to bring him, particularly by his name FATHER, into the closest and most endearing relations with humanity; and, in the second place, that while, in the economy through which God redeems the world, the names Son and Spirit are of indispensable use and a gracious provision for the soul's wants, yet it is not as members of a Trinity, but as separate agents of Him who is sole Original of all the forces of Nature and of Grace, that their necessity is felt and their use recognized.

We do not propose to follow Dr. Bushnell in what may be called the supplement of his argument. In this he endeavors to find an interior necessity in the nature of God for the Trinity, — a necessity by which he is datelessly and for ever becoming three, and thus accommodated in his action to the categories of finite apprehension. We quote a single paragraph, as exhibiting the tenor of the whole: —

“ If, then, we dare to assume what is the deepest, most adorable fact of God's nature, — that he is a being infinite, *inherently related in act* to the finite, otherwise impossible ever to be found in that relation, thus and therefore a being who is everlastingly threeing himself in his action, to be and to be known as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, from eternity to eternity, — we are brought out full upon the Christian Trinity, and that in the simple line of practical inquiry itself. It is nothing but the doctrine that *God is a being practically related to his creatures*. And for just this reason it was that Christ, in the commission given to his disciples, set forth his formula of Trinity as a comprehensive designation of the Gospel, and a revelation of the everlasting ground it has in the inherent properties of God. He calls it therein as emphatically as possible his ‘everlasting Gospel,’ a work as old as the Trinity of God, a valid and credible work, because it is based in the Trinity of God.”

Our readers, like ourselves, must be quite weary by this time of trying to tread their way through these in-

tricacies of thought and speculation. The simple terms *God* and *Father*, bringing the Infinite into relations of nearness and fellowship with man, and, at the same time, filling the soul with a sense of the immeasurable vastness of its Author, sweep all this laborious reasoning away. The truth as it is in Jesus turns into derision, by its simplicity, all this abstruseness and complexity in which the doctrine of the True God is involved. Nowhere does Christ speak of God as "eternally *threeing* himself." Such words would have sounded strangely from his lips who borrowed the strongest monotheistic language of the Old Testament, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," to express his own conception of the Divine Unity.

Notwithstanding the idea is so confidently put forth that Jesus taught the Trinity, that he made it, indeed, the sum and essence of his Gospel, yet we as confidently affirm, that neither directly nor by implication does he refer to the Trinity, or give a hint by anything he said that so strange a fantasy had ever entered his thought. If the Trinity is that important practical truth which Dr. Bushnell has so ingeniously and elaborately maintained, why, in the name of mercy, did he who "spake as never man spake," and who came "to show us the Father," pass it over in utter silence? Why is it that neither the word *Trinity*, nor any equivalent for it, is to be found in the records of his sayings and discourses? Why, indeed, did he not repeat it here and there, over and over again, till there could be no room for mistake? Why did he not, at least *once*, in all his ministry, either privately to his disciples or publicly to the multitudes, refer to God in a manner corresponding to that which Dr. Bushnell so freely uses in the pages we have been examining? Will it be answered, He *does* reveal the doctrine clearly. We reply, To our mind he does *not* reveal it; and to thousands of other minds as intelligent, as discriminating, as open to truth, as candid and impartial in judgment, as any that have ever given their attention to the study of Christianity, he does not reveal it. The inference is irresistible, that it is not *clearly* revealed; and the probabilities from this fact rise almost to certainty, that it is not revealed at all. Indeed, this is substantially admitted by learned Trinitarians. Thus

Neander, in a paragraph, part of which is quoted by Dr. Bushnell, says: "This doctrine [Trinity] does not strictly belong to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith; as appears sufficiently evident from the fact that it is expressly held forth in no one particular passage of the New Testament." *

We are prepared to go a step farther. Not only is this doctrine *not* revealed, but it is *excluded* by what is expressly taught throughout the New Testament. Not only is it no part of Christianity, but it has been inserted into the faith of the Church in contradiction to what Christianity explicitly teaches. Jesus never taught that the proper name of God is "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost"; never addressed him or spoke of him by that name; and there is no example of any Apostle referring to God, in discourse or other writing, nor in worship, by any name or form of address implying Trinity. Still more; these all do use names for God, and address him in worship by terms which seem to compel the conviction that they thought of him, felt towards him, adored him, sought him, in the simple unity of his nature. No ingenuity can work itself into the belief that Jesus, when he prayed, saying, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" either prayed as the equal of that Father in power and glory, or had in his mind, as the object to whom the petition was addressed, a triune divine personality. The idea is wholly incredible. Nor is it more easy to believe that the Apostles, when they spoke of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," had not in their minds a being, closely related to Jesus indeed, but yet as distinct from him as any human father from his child. The words used not only admit, but *require*, this construction. They could not have been fairly and honestly used with a view to any other construction. When a company of disciples — as is recorded of them — "lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is; of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were

* Hist. Christian Religion and Church, Vol. I. p. 572.

gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done,"—it seems scarcely within the bounds of credibility that this company were not all strict Unitarians in their conceptions of the Divine Being. Almost every word used is in itself alone proof that they did not regard Christ as supreme and underrived. "Thy child,"—"whom thou hast *anointed*,"—"thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done" with reference to him;—can the mind receive it, that these disciples *believed* that the "child" they spoke of as "anointed" of God, and as put to death in conformity to the "counsel" of God, was himself, in any sense whatever, or by any stretch of imagination, to be regarded as "the Lord God which made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is"? And when it is remembered that Peter and John were of this company, and probably leaders in the holy song, the evidence, while it is of a piece with that furnished by nearly every page of the New Testament, and by no means peculiar in its force, is conclusive that these two Apostles had never received a hint, either from the lips of Jesus or from the Holy Ghost, that Christ was to be believed in as God, and to share the worship of men with the Father to whose glory he had opened their eyes.

Each of the four Gospels gives the writer's whole view of Christ; or rather presents those features of his character and points of his history which had made the strongest impression on the writer's mind. Take, then, the first Gospel,—of Matthew,—and where appears in it the faintest trace of belief in Jesus as God? We are not aware that a single text is quoted from it in favor of the Trinity, except that containing the formula of baptism. The placing of the three New Names of the Christian dispensation in such relation to each other is thought to indicate that equality and unity of the persons which is fitly expressed by the word Trinity. To us it conveys, as we have already said, no such idea. We think that no intelligent Jew or Gentile of the first age of Christianity, having never before heard of the Trinity, after carefully reading the Gospel according to Matthew from beginning to end, would have laid down the book under an impression that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were *together* the one God of Christianity. As to the associa-

tion of these three names in the direction concerning baptism, while it is most natural, since they are names first distinctly revealed by the Gospel, no evidence is afforded by it that the three are one. In Luke, the Saviour is reported as saying, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels'." Are the holy angels, the Father, and the Son to be regarded, on account of this juxtaposition of names, as equal in glory and equally entitled to worship? In this Gospel — of Luke — the formula of baptism is not given; and there is no text that lends the least support to the Trinitarian hypothesis. Suppose now it had so happened that some community, among the many that embraced Christianity during the apostolic age, had received this Gospel, and no other, and had sought in all sincerity to build themselves up on its great moral and religious ideas, to follow the Christ there presented, to give practical effect to the precepts touching the heart and the life there recorded, to obtain the gift of the Holy Spirit there promised, to secure the eternal life there proclaimed, and to worship the Father there disclosed to faith. In the first place, does any one imagine that this would have been a *Trinitarian* community? and, in the second place, is it denied that it would have been a *Christian* community?

But there are declarations in each of the Gospels, as we have said, which contradict and exclude the idea of Trinity. Take this, in Luke, as an example: "A certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God." Here is the Teacher of a new religion addressing a man who had never thought of God except as the one Jehovah. By the supposition of Trinitarianism, the fundamental and all-including idea of the new religion is the union of Christ as co-equal with the Father in a Godhead of three persons. An opportunity is here presented of fixing this grand idea in the inquirer's mind. Does Jesus use the opportunity for that purpose? So far from it, that, if his sole object had been to confute and annul such an idea, he could not have framed human language into a sentence more effective for the pur-

pose than this which we have quoted. Could he have imagined as a thing possible, that the ruler, after this answer, would go away believing that he had been conversing with one whose aim was to establish amongst men the worship of himself as God? Must he not have known that, so far from having made a convert to the Trinity by the answer, and thus laid the corner-stone of his religion in that soul, he had by his words, as explicitly as possible, confirmed the inquirer in his "cold and feeble monotheism"? Take another example. In the last solemn and awful moment of the crucifixion, with the whole world prospectively listening to his words, Jesus, when he had cried with a loud voice, said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Now, is it possible that a single mind from the whole world could receive any other impression from this sublime *de profundis* of a suffering but departing spirit, than that it was the utterance of a derived and dependent, though most exalted, being? Is it conceivable that such words could have been spoken by one conscious of being himself the equal of the Father, and therefore needing nothing of him; or by one whose mission had been to found a religion, the fundamental truth of which is — the Trinity? The language used under the circumstances, we say, according to all established modes of thinking, necessarily excludes the idea of Trinity, and leaves one directly the reverse of that which Dr. Bushnell assumes as the substance of Christianity.

Pass into the Gospel of John. We meet in the opening a passage which Trinitarians think conclusive against us, but in which we find our own view distinctly set forth. The Trinity surely is not taught in it. For whatever interpretation may be given to it, no one claims to find in it more than *two* divine persons. Of these two, the language used authorizes us to say that one is the Source, the Original, of the other. For while that spiritual effluence which is called the Word was in the beginning with God, and so of the very essence of God, yet when it "became flesh" it went forth from God and took a distinct conscious life, which was "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express *image* of his person." So that the two names *Word* and *God* represent two distinct beings and two

distinct ideas. The term *Word* does not suggest to any mind the same personality as the name *God*. It is God projected into manifestation, — God revealed in man, — God made known through a human shekinah; not the veritable Jehovah. Destroy the shekinah, — let the great Revealer cease to be (if the supposition were possible), — let the holy and blessed manifestation be withdrawn for ever, — still God would exist *without the Word*; not seen, as now, through Christ, but dwelling in light inaccessible and full of glory. In immediate connection with this passage, it is said by the writer of it: "No man hath seen *God* at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him." Here are two statements, both of which contradict and exclude the idea of Trinity. If in John's view Christ had been in any sense *God*, could he who had so often seen him and leaned on his bosom have said truly, No man hath seen God? And when it is said, "the only-begotten Son hath declared Him," is it not evident that, in the view of the writer, the *Him* declared was a different being from the *Son* declaring? When in the same sentence Jesus is called "only *begotten*," the word italicized is a refutation of the doctrine in question. Nor is its refuting power weakened by the invention (in order to conceal its force) of the phrase "eternal generation," which is but a verbal paradox without meaning. In the sixteenth chapter of this Gospel it is written: "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." These words plainly exclude the Trinity. They point to a coming period — it matters not when — during which (they teach disciples) men are to ask nothing of Christ, but everything of God *in Christ's name*. Now we confidently ask, would any man of common understanding, not trained in the intricacies of the Augustinian theology, sincerely desirous of being guided in his whole spiritual life by the Saviour, feel at liberty, after reading these words, to address his petitions indiscriminately to the Father and the Son, "using the plurality with the utmost unconcern," and "allowing it to blend, in the freest manner possible, with all his acts of worship"?

Passages to the same effect might be multiplied in-

definitely from every part of the New Testament. We give but one or two more. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says: "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." Does not this text manifestly exclude the idea of Trinity? In other words, can this statement and the dogma of Trinity both be true? If it be true that Paul believed in the equality of Christ with God, it is true also that he believed in the equality of man with Christ, and of woman with man; and his words here convey an idea in direct contradiction of his faith. Once more. Against all idol-worship this Apostle, in the same Epistle, asserts that "*there is none other God but one.*" He makes this assertion in such connections of thought as forbid that he should have regarded Christ as one of three persons constituting the "one" God. For he immediately proceeds to tell his readers who that one God is, to distinguish him,—to distinguish him from Christ. He is "the FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him." And as if to show that Christ was in no wise included, he mentions him separately: "And one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." We say, then, that the Apostle's conception of God did *not* include in it Jesus Christ; that *his* "mind" was not "thrown into a maze of sublimity, and made to feel at once the vastness, and with that the close society also of God" by the "cross relations of a threefold grammatic personality"; but whatever Francis Junius of Heidelberg, the mild and sober Howe, Jeremy Taylor, the Marquis de Rentz, Edwards, and Lady Maxwell may have done, Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, first in the roll of Christian teachers and saints, when he worshipped, did not worship a complex Divinity, but the One — never threeing himself — for ever and simply the one "God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," who is also "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"; and that there was no playing of his thought through the images of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, gliding and alternating from one to the other, according to the mood of the moment or the subject in mind, but always a single, particular, invariable reference to the one being represented in Christianity by the name Father.

To share the mind of Christ on this great subject; to enter into the thought and feeling of his Apostles, making their inspiration the guide of our faith; to bow down with them in that deeply-adoring yet all-confiding worship, which, in prayer and song, they lifted up to the High and Holy One, who, though embosomed in mystery awful and infinite, had condescended to let his goodness pass before them "in the face of Jesus Christ," and to express his nearness to them through that name which, more than Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, is the abiding joy of the filial heart,—the name of FATHER;—if there is any aim of the Christian soul higher than this, if there is any mount of vision from which vaster wonders in the immeasurable realm of divine grace can be discovered, it has not yet been revealed to us, and we must wait the disclosure.

In thus maintaining the absolute supremacy of the Father, Unitarians are liable to a misapprehension which we especially wish to avoid. Trinitarians may be led to suppose that we do not "honor the Son" as really and heartily as we do the Father; that we are unwilling to receive him in his highest character and offices; that we do not render to him that perfect allegiance which sinners who regard him as their all-sufficient Saviour delight to yield. To guard against this misapprehension, we have simply to affirm, that we stand, as we think, on the creed of the New Testament. We use the language of the Apostles in the sense in which they used it. There are no terms employed by them to exalt the Saviour that we do not need for expressing our profound sense of the wonderfulness of his nature, the grandeur of his character, and the importance and dignity of his mission. Overwhelmed by the weight of obligation laid upon us by him, no words of man's device, but such only as the Holy Ghost teacheth, can adequately clothe the sentiments of our hearts towards him; and there is no phraseology adopted by prophet, evangelist, or apostle, to assert the magnitude of his office, the majesty of his person, or the momentous consequences involved in the alternative of receiving or rejecting him, that our souls do not spontaneously fill out to the full from their own sure and deep convictions. Does some prophet, seeing in him God manifested, call him "Immanuel"? Verily, in him God

is with *us*. Beholding in vision the miraculous establishment, the strength and wisdom, the peacefulness and perpetuity, of the Messiah's reign, does he name him "Wonderful, Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of peace"? Amen. The prophet cannot go beyond the historian; nay, the historian and the prophet meet in the mount of holy contemplation, using the same lofty imagery to invest with superhuman attributes the peerless object of their common admiration and praise. Glorifying in the regal majesty and dominion of his Lord, does some raptured saint, with his ear near to God, hear a "voice from the excellent glory" addressing the Son: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom; thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows"? Even so, amen. *Laudate Dominum*. We rejoice; we exult; we give thanks; we chant our response with the Church, and say, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God," not *homoiousion* with the Arians, but *homoousion* with the Athanasians; and none shall receive a heavier meaning from those divinely loaded words than we. Does some apostolic seer, caught up into the heavens, hear a loud voice proceeding from "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" of angels, saying, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing"? We would take up and repeat the celestial refrain, "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

But we can have no Trinity. Enoch who walked with God, Abraham and the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets, — in whose matchless dress our loftiest conceptions of the Divine Being are clothed, — had no Trinity. The Saviour had no Trinity. The Apostles of our Lord had no Trinity. The Church for three hundred years had no Trinity. The three hundred bishops of the Council of Nice met, deliberated, and parted, but established no Trinity. Trinity belongs to the Romish communion, with the worship of the Virgin and the adoration of Saints. Protestantism should disown it. It is a barbar-

ism of language covering a falsity in belief. Whenever a Protestant Christian finds that he is unable to express his faith in the words of Holy Writ, but is obliged to resort to a heathen dialect to help him out, the legitimate inference is that he is in error, and his first duty is to adjust his faith to the Scripture standard.

Let the name of Christ be held in sacred remembrance; let it be associated with all that is grandest in faith, and holiest in worship; let the same breath that articulates the soul's trust in the Almighty Father, and supplication for the Holy Spirit, syllable the love of the Only-begotten Son;— but let it be also reverently confessed that behind all, above all, and filling all, is Highest God “without variableness or shadow of turning,” who said of the Son, “*This day have I begotten thee,*” and who, if Christ and all the hosts of heaven were annihilated, would still live in the unapproached and unfathomable perfection of his nature.

It is one of the highest offices of science to extend, to human apprehension, the boundaries — to enlarge the dimensions — of the outward creation, and thus to magnify our conceptions of the for ever inconceivable grandeur and glory of its Author. In this work it has been given to no mortal to proceed farther, to ascend higher, than Sir Isaac Newton. Yet Sir Isaac Newton, from his sublime and awful investigations, before which the veil of the heavens was rent in twain from top to bottom, brought back report of no Trinity. It is one of the noblest offices of the imagination to idealize the facts of science, to stand upon its loftiest summits, and, looking upward and around, to form a creation of its own, corresponding to that which is known, but with all its splendors infinitely intensified, all its beauties and sublimities immeasurably heightened, and the God whom it devoutly contemplates engirded with glories which no man can look upon and live, — majestic, resplendent, unutterable. Into this hidden region of wonders, this abyss of mystery divine, who among men has penetrated farther than the author of *Paradise Lost*? Yet, from all the immense realm he explores, from its myriads of altars built upon the stars, from the recesses of its temples served by angelic priesthoods, from all its shining tiers of cherubim and seraphim, from the seat of its Almighty Lord, Milton brings report of no Trinity; but falls down with us to

worship the One Supreme, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

One word more. It is evident that there is a disposition on the part of many Protestant Trinitarians to relax the rigor with which the dogma of Trinity has been insisted on, and to seek a basis of union with Protestants who do not receive that dogma, but who are equally with them opposed to all ecclesiasticism and mere sacerdotal authority, in a faith less complex and abstruse, and more in accordance with the language of Scripture. Such are beginning to see that, after all, a true faith in Christ — a *saving* faith — is not inconsistent with a literal interpretation of his words, "My Father is greater than I"; and that practically the subtone of religion is as heavy, its working as beneficent, its promise as inspiring, when he is believed in as the highest manifestation of God, as when he is worshipped as the equal of God.

"How many," Dr. Bushnell says, "of the formally-professed believers of the doctrine are free to acknowledge that they see no practical value in it, and will even blame the preacher who maintains it for spending his time and breath in a matter so far out of the way of the practical life, a merely curious article or riddle of the faith! And how many others, even of the more serious class of believers, would say, if they were to speak out what is in their feeling, that they take the Trinity as a considerable drawback on the idea of God! They would recoil indeed from the thought, as being even a blamable irreverence, of imagining any improvement of God; but if they could think of him as a simple unit of personality, in the manner of the Unitarians, he would consciously be just so much more to their mind, and their practical relations towards him would be proportionally cleared and comforted."

Towards all such,—and they are the more serious, active, and earnest spirits of the various sects to which they belong,—our hearts confess to a strong yearning. With them, we would reverently bow the knee, acknowledging Jesus as "Lord, to the glory of God the Father." With them, we would unite our strength in a holy warfare against all the powers of darkness in the name of that Word which is the light of men; and with them, at each new victory, whether on Christian or Pagan soil, we would echo the shout of the armies of heaven, "Alleluia! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth."

J. W. T.

ART. II. — THE RABBINICAL DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE.

THE starting-point in the Talmud on this subject is with the effects of sin upon the human race. Man was made radiant, pure, immortal, in the image of God. By sin he was obscured, defiled, burdened with mortal decay and judgment. In this representation that misery and death were an after-doom brought into the world by sin, the Rabbinical authorities strikingly agree. The testimony is irresistible. We need not quote confirmations of this statement, as every scholar will accept it at once. But as to what is meant precisely by the term "death," as used in such a connection, there is no little obscurity and diversity of opinion. In all probability some of the Pharisaical fathers, perhaps the majority of them, conceived that, if Adam had not sinned, he and his posterity would have been physically immortal, and would either have lived for ever on the earth, or have been successively transferred to the home of Jehovah over the firmament. They call the Devil, who is the chief accuser in the heavenly court of justice, and the angel of death, by the name of "Sammael." Rabbi Reuben says: "When Sammael saw Adam sin, he immediately sought to slay him, and went to the heavenly council and clamored for justice against him, pleading thus: 'God made this decree, "In the day thou eatest of the tree thou shalt surely die." Therefore give him to me, for he is mine, and I will kill him; to this end was I created; and give me power over all his descendants.' When the celestial Sanhedrim perceived that his petition was just, they decreed that it should be granted."* A great many expressions of kindred tenor might easily be adduced, leaving it hardly possible to doubt, — as indeed we are not aware that any one does doubt, — that many of the Jews literally held that sin was the sole cause of bodily dissolution. But, on the other hand, there were as certainly others who did not entertain that idea, but who understood and explained the terms in which it was sometimes conveyed in a different, a partially figurative sense. Rabbi

* Schoettgenii *Dissertatio de Hierosolyma Cœlesti*, Cap. III. sect. 9.

Samuel Ben David writes: "Although the first Adam had not sinned, yet death would have been, for death was created on the first day." The reference here is, as Rabbi Berechias explains, to the account in Genesis where we read that "darkness was upon the face of the deep," "by which is to be understood the angel of death, who has darkened the face of man." * There were, too, very prevalent among the Talmudists, the conceptions of the pre-existence of souls in heaven, and of a spiritual body investing and fitting the soul for heaven, as the present carnal body invests and fits it for the earth. Schoettgen has collected numerous illustrations in point, of which the following may serve as specimens.† "When the first Adam had not sinned, he was every way an angel of the Lord, perfect and spotless, and it was decreed that he should live for ever like one of the celestial ministers." "The soul cannot ascend into Paradise except it be first invested with a clothing adapted to that world, as the present is for this world." These notions do not harmonize with the thought that man was originally destined for a physical eternity on this globe. All this difficulty disappears, we think, and the true metaphorical force often intended in the word "death" comes to view, through the following conception, occupying the minds of a portion of the Jewish Rabbins, as we are led to believe by the clews furnished in the close connection between the Pharisaic and the Zoroastrian eschatology, by similar hints in various parts of the New Testament, and by some quite explicit declarations in the Talmud itself, which we shall soon cite in a different connection. God at first intended that man should live in pure blessedness on the earth for a time, and then without pain should undergo a glorious change, making him a perfect peer of the angels, and be translated to their lofty abode in his own presence; but when he sinned, God gave him over to manifold suffering, and on the destruction of his body adjudged his naked soul to descend to a doleful imprisonment below the grave. The immortality meant for man was a timely ascent to heaven in a paradisaal clothing, without dying. The doom brought on

* Schoettgenii *Horæ Biblicæ et Talmudicæ*, in Rom. v. 12, et in Johan. iii. 19.

† *Ibid.*, in 2 Cor. v. 2.

him by sin was the alteration of that desirable change of bodies and ascension to the supernal splendors, for a permanent disembodiment and dreaded descent to the subterranean glooms. It is a Talmudical as much as it is a Pauline idea, that the triumphant power of the Messiah would restore what the unfortunate fall of Adam lost. Now if we can show, as we think we can, and as we shall try to in a later part of this article, that the later Jews expected the Messianic resurrection to be the prelude to an ascent into heaven, and not the beginning of a gross earthly immortality, it will powerfully confirm the theory which we have just indicated. "When," says one of the old Rabbins, "the dead in Israelitish earth are restored alive," their bodies will be "as the body of the first Adam before he sinned, and they shall all fly into the air like birds."*

At all events, whether the general Rabbinical belief was in the primitive destination of man to a heavenly or to an earthly immortality,—whether the "death" decreed upon him in consequence of sin was the dissolution of the body or the wretchedness of the soul,—they do all agree that the banishment of souls into the realm of blackness under the grave was a part of the penalty of sin. Some of them maintained, as we think, that, had there been no sin, souls would have passed to heaven in glorified bodies; others of them maintained, as we think, that, had there been no sin, they would have lived eternally upon earth in their present bodies; but all of them agreed, as is undisputed, that in consequence of sin souls were condemned to the under-world. No man would have seen the dismal realm of the sepulchre, had there not been sin. The earliest Hebrew conception was that all souls alike went down to a common abode, to spend eternity in dark slumber or nerveless groping. This view was first modified soon after the Persian captivity, by the expectation that there would be discrimination at the resurrection which the Jews had learned to look for, when the just should rise, but the wicked should be left. The next alteration of their notions on this subject was the subdivision of the under-world into Paradise and Gehenna; a conception known among them probably as

* Schoettgen, in 1 Cor. xv. 44.

early as a century before Christ, and very prominent with them in the apostolic age. "When Rabbi Jochanan was dying, his disciples asked him, 'Light of Israel, main pillar of the right, thou strong hammer, why dost thou weep?' He answered, 'Two paths open before me; the one leading to bliss, the other to torments; and I know not which of them will be my doom.'"^{*} "Paradise is separated from hell by a distance no greater than the width of a thread."[†] So in Christ's parable of Dives and Lazarus, Abraham's bosom and hell are two divisions. "There are three doors into Gehenna; one in the wilderness, where Korah and his company were swallowed; one in the sea, where Jonah descended when he 'cried out of the belly of hell'; one in Jerusalem, for the Lord says, 'My furnace is in Jerusalem.'"[‡] "The under-world is divided into palaces, each of which is so large that it would take a man three hundred years to roam over it. There are distinct apartments where the hell-punishments are inflicted. One place is so dark that its name is 'Night-of-Horrors.'"[§] "In Paradise there are certain mansions for the pious from the Gentile peoples, and for those mundane kings who have done kindness to the Israelites."^{||} "The fire of Gehenna was kindled on the evening of the first Sabbath, and shall never be extinguished."[¶] The Egyptians, Persians, Hindoos, and Greeks, with all of whom the Jews held relations of intercourse, had, in their popular representations of the under-world of the dead, regions of peace and honor for the good, and regions of fire for the bad. The idea may have been adopted from them by the Jews, or it may have been at last developed among themselves, first by the imaginative poetical, and afterwards by the literally believing, transference below of historical and local imagery and associations, such as those connected with the engulfing of Sodom and Gomorrah in fire and sulphur, and with the loathed fires in the valley of Hinnom.

^{*} Talmud tr. Berachoth.

[†] Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, Theil II. Kap. V. Seite 315.

[‡] Lightfoot, in Matt. v. 22.

[§] Schröder's *Satzungen und Gebräuche des talmudisch-rabbinischen Judenthums*, (Bremen, 1851,) p. 408.

^{||} Schoettgen, in *Johan.* xiv. 2.

[¶] *Nov. Test. ex Talmude, etc. illustratum* a J. G. Meuschen, p. 125.

Many of the Rabbins believed in the transmigration or revolution of souls, an immemorial doctrine of the East, and carried it out in the most ludicrous and marvellous details.* But with the exception of those who adopted this Indian doctrine, the Rabbins supposed all departed souls to be in the under-world, some in the division of Paradise, others in that of Hell. Here they fancied these souls to be longingly awaiting the advent of the Messiah. "Messiah and the patriarchs weep together in Paradise over the delay of the time of the kingdom." † In this quotation the Messiah is represented as being in the under-world, for the Jews expected that he would be a man, very likely some one who had already lived. Thus a delegation was once sent to ask Jesus, "Art thou Elias? art thou the Messiah? art thou that prophet?" Light is thus thrown upon the Rabbinical saying, that "it was doubted whether the Messiah would come from the living, or the dead." ‡ Borrowing some Persian modes of thinking, and adding them to their own inordinate national pride, the Rabbins soon began to fancy that the observance or non-observance of the Pharisaic ritual, and kindred particulars, must exert a great effect in determining the destination of souls, and their condition in the under-world. Observe the following quotations from the Talmud. "Abraham sits at the gate of hell to see that no Israelite enters." "Circumcision is so agreeable to God, that he swore to Abraham that no one who was circumcised should descend into hell." § "What does Abraham to those circumcised who have sinned too much? He takes the foreskins from Gentile boys who died without circumcision, and places them on those Jews who were circumcised but have become godless, and so kicks them into hell." || Hell here denotes that division in the under-world where the condemned are punished. The younger Buxtorf, in a preface to his father's "*Synagoga Judaica*," gives numerous specimens of Jewish representations of "the efficacy of circumcision being so great, that no one who has undergone it shall go

* Basnage's *Hist. of Jews*, Lib. IV. cap. 30. Also, *Traditions of the Rabbins*, in Blackwood for April, 1833.

† Eisenmenger, *Theil II. Seite 304.*

‡ Lightfoot, in *Matt. ii. 16.*

§ Schröder, *Seite 332.*

|| Eisenmenger, *Theil II. Kap. VI. Seite 340.*

down into hell." Children can help their deceased parents out of hell by their good deeds, prayers, and offerings.* "Beyond all doubt," says Gfrörer, "the ancient Jewish synagogue inculcated the doctrine of supererogatory good works, the merit of which went to benefit departed souls."† Here all souls were, in the under-world; either in that part of it called Paradise, or in that named Gehenna, according to certain conditions. But in whichever place they were, and under whatever circumstances, they were all tarrying in expectation of the advent of the Messiah.

How deeply rooted, how eagerly cherished, the Jewish belief in the approaching appearance of the Messiah was, and what a splendid group of ideas and imaginations they clustered around his reign, are well-known facts. He was to be a descendant of royal David, an inspired prophet, priest, and king, was to subdue the whole earth beneath his Jewish sceptre, and establish from Jerusalem a theocratic empire of unexampled glory and holiness and delight. In so much the consent was general and earnest, though in regard to many further details there would seem to have been incongruous diversity of opinions. They supposed the coming of the Messiah would be preceded by ten frightful woes;‡ also by the appearance of the prophet Elias as a forerunner.§ There are a few passages in the Rabbinical writings, which, unless they were forged and interpolated by Christians at a late period, show that there were in the Jewish mind anticipations of the personal descent of the Messiah into the under-world.|| "After this the Messiah, the son of David, came to the gates of the under-world. But when the bound, who are in Gehenna, saw the light of the Messiah, they began rejoicing to receive him, saying, 'He shall lead us up from this darkness.'" "The captives shall ascend from the under-world, Schechinah at their

* Eisenmenger, Theil II. Seite 357.

† Geschichte des Urchristenthums, Zweite Abtheilung, Seite 186. So also Maimonides asserts the doctrine of supererogatory works: see p. 237 of H. H. Bernard's Selections from the Yod Hachazakah of Maimonides.

‡ Surenhusii Mischna, Pars Tertia, p. 308.

§ Lightfoot, in Matt. xvii. 10.

|| For a general view of the Jewish eschatology, see Gfrörer's Geschichte des Urchristenthums, Kap. X.; Eisenmenger's Entdecktes Yudenthum, Theil II. Kap. XV. - XVII.

head." * Gfrörer derives the origin of the doctrine that Christ rescued souls out of the under-world, from a Jewish notion, preserved in the Talmud,† that the just patriarchs sometimes did it. ‡ Bertholdt adduces Talmudical declarations to show that through the Messiah "God would hereafter liberate the Israelites from the under-world, on account of the merit of circumcision." § Schoettgen quotes this statement from the Sohar: "Messiah shall die, and shall remain in the state of death a time, and shall rise." || The so-called Fourth Book of Ezra says, in the seventh chapter: "My son, the Christ, shall die: then follow the resurrection and the judgment." Although it is clear, from various other sources, as well as from the account in John xii. 34, that there was a prevalent expectation among the Jews that "the Messiah would abide for ever," yet it also seems quite certain that there were at the same time at least obscure presentiments, based on prophecies and traditions, that he must die,—that an important part of his mission was connected with his death. This appears from such passages as we have cited above, found in early Rabbinical writers, who would certainly be very unlikely to borrow and adapt a new idea of such a character from the Christians; and from the manner in which Jesus assumes his death to be a part of the Messianic fate, and interprets the Scriptures as necessarily pointing to that effect. He charges his disciples with being "fools and blind" in not so understanding the doctrine; thus seeming to imply that it was plainly known to some. But this question, the origin of the idea of a suffering, atoning, dying Messiah, is confessedly a very nice and obscure one. The evidence, the silence, the inferences, the presumptions and doubts on the subject, are such, that some of the most thorough and impartial students say they are unable to decide either way.

However the foregoing question be decided, it is confessed by all, that the Jews earnestly looked for a resur-

* Schoettgen, *De Messia*, Lib. VI. cap. 5, sect. 1.

† Eisenmenger, *Theil II.* Seite 343, 364.

‡ *Geschichte Urchrist.*, Kap. VIII. Seite 184.

§ *Christologia Judæorum Jesu Apostolarumque Ætate*, sect. 34 (*De Descensu Mesismæ ad Inferos*).

|| *De Messia*, Lib. VI. cap. 5, sect. 2.

rection of the dead as an accompaniment of the Messiah's coming. Whether Christ was to go down into the under-world, or to sit enthroned on Mount Zion, in either case, the dead should come up and live again on earth at the blast of his summoning trumpet. Rabbi Jeremiah commanded, "When you bury me, put shoes on my feet, and give me a staff in my hand, and lay me on one side, that when the Messiah comes I may be ready."* Most of the Rabbins made this resurrection partial. "Whoever denies the resurrection of the dead shall have no part in it, for the very reason that he denies it."† Rabbi Abbu says: "A day of rain is greater than the resurrection of the dead; because the rain is for all, while the resurrection is only for the just."‡ "Sodom and Gomorrah shall not rise in the resurrection of the dead."§ Rabbi Chebbo says: "The patriarchs so vehemently desired to be buried in the land of Israel, because those who are dead in that land shall be the first to revive and shall devour his years. But for those just who are interred beyond the holy land, it is to be understood that God will make a passage in the earth, through which they will be rolled until they reach the land of Israel."|| Rabbi Jochanan says: "Moses died out of the holy land, in order to show that in the same way that God will raise up Moses, so he will raise all those who observe his law." The national bigotry of the Jews reaches a pitch of extravagance in some of their views that is amusing. For instance, they declare that "one Israelitish soul is dearer and more important to God, than all the souls of a whole nation of the Gentiles"! Again, they say: "When God judges the Israelites, he will stand, and make the judgment brief and mild: when he judges the Gentiles he will sit, and make it long and severe"! They affirm that the resurrection will be effected by means of a dew; and they quote, to that effect, this verse from Canticles: "I sleep, but my heart waketh; my head is filled with dew, and my locks with drops of the night." Some assert that "the resurrection will be im-

* Lightfoot, in Matt. xxvii. 52.

† Witsii *Dissertatio de Seculo*, etc., sect. 9.

‡ Nov. Test. illustratum, etc. a Meuschen, p. 62.

§ Schoettgen, in Johan. vi. 39.

|| Schoettgen, *De Messia*, Lib. VI. cap. 6, sect. 27.

mediately caused by God, who never gives to any one the three keys of birth, rain, and the resurrection of the dead." Others say that the power to raise and judge the dead will be delegated to the Messiah, and even go so far as to assert that the trumpet whose formidable blasts will then shake the universe is to be one of the horns of that ram which Abraham offered up instead of his son Isaac! Some confine the resurrection to faithful Jews, some extend it to the whole Jewish nation, some think all the righteous of the earth will have part in it, and some stretch its pale around all mankind alike.* They seem to agree that the reprobate would either be left in the wretched regions of Sheol when the just arose, or else be thrust back after the judgment, to remain there for ever. It was believed that the righteous after their resurrection would never die again, but ascend to heaven. The Jews came after a time, when the increase of geographical knowledge had annihilated from the earth their old Eden whence the sinful Adam was expelled, to change its location into the sky. Thither, as the later fables ran, Elijah was borne in his chariot of fire by the horses thereof. Rabbi Pinchas says: "Carefulness leads us to innocence, innocence to purity, purity to sanctity, sanctity to humility, humility to fear of sins, fear of sins to piety, piety to the holy spirit, the holy spirit to the resurrection of the dead, the resurrection of the dead to the prophet Elias."† The writings of the early Christian Fathers contain many allusions to this blessed habitation of saints above the clouds. It is illustrated in the following quaint Rabbinical narrative. Rabbi Jehosha Ben Levi once besought the angel of death to take him up, ere he died, to catch a glimpse of Paradise. Standing on the wall, he suddenly snatched the angel's sword and sprang over, swearing by Almighty God that he would not come out. Death was not allowed to enter Paradise, and the son of Levi did not restore his sword until he had promised to be more gentle towards the dying.‡ The righteous were never to return to the dust, but "at

* See an able dissertation on Jewish Notions of the Resurrection of the Dead, prefixed to Humphrey's translation of Athenagoras on the Resurrection.

† Surenhusii Mischna, Pars Tertia, p. 309.

‡ Schröder, p. 419.

the end of the thousand years," — the duration of the Messiah's earthly reign, — "when the Lord is lifted up, God shall fit wings to the just, like the wings of eagles." * In a word, the Messiah and his redeemed ones would ascend into heaven to the right hand of God. So Paul, who said, "I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee," declares that, when the dead have risen, "we shall be caught up in the clouds to be for ever with the Lord."

We forbear to notice a thousand curious details of speculation and fancy in which individual Rabbins indulged; for instance, their common notion concerning the bone *Luz*, the single bone which, withstanding dissolution, shall form the nucleus of the resurrection body. It was a very prevalent belief with them, that the resurrection would take place in the valley of Jehosaphat, in proof of which they quote this text from Joel: "Let the heathen be wakened and come up to the valley of Jehosaphat; for there will I sit to judge the nations around." Still, wherever scattered abroad, the faithful Jews cling to the expectation of the Messiah's coming, and associate with his day the resurrection of the dead. † The statement in the Song of Solomon, "The king is held in the galleries," means, says a Rabbinical book, "that the Messiah is detained in Paradise, fettered by a woman's hair"! Every day, throughout the world, every consistent Israelite repeats the words of Moses Maimonides, the peerless Rabbi, of whom it is a proverb, that "from Moses to Moses there arose not a Moses": — "I believe with a perfect faith that the Messiah will come, and though he delays, nevertheless I will always expect him till he come." Then shall glory cover the living, and the risen, children of Israel, and confusion fall on their Gentile foes. In almost every inch of the beautiful valley of Jehosaphat a Jew has been buried. All over the slopes of the hill-sides around lie the thick-clustering sepulchral slabs, showing how eagerly the chosen people seek to sleep in the very spot where the first rising of the dead shall be. Entranced and mute

" In old Jehosaphat's vale, they
Of Israel think the assembled world
Will stand upon that awful day,

* Schoettgen, *De Messia*, Lib. VI. cap. 6, sect. 23; cap. 7, sect. 3, 4.

† John Allen's *Modern Judaism*, Chap. VI. and XV.

When the Ark's light, aloft unfurled,
Among the opening clouds shall shine,
Divinity's own radiant shrine."

Any one familiar with the Persian theology * will at once notice a striking resemblance between many of its dogmas and those, first, of Pharisaism, secondly, of the popular Christianity. Some examination of this subject properly belongs here. There is, then, as is well known, a circle or group of ideas, particularly pertaining to eschatology, which appear in the later Jewish writings, and remarkably correspond to those held by the Parsees, the followers of Zoroaster. The same notions also reappear in the early Christianity as popularly understood. We will specify some of these correspondences. The doctrine of angels, received by the Jews, — their names, offices, rank, and destiny, — was borrowed and formed by them during and just after the Babylonish captivity, and is very like that they found among their enslavers.† The guardian angels appointed over nations, spoken of by Daniel, are Persian. The angels called in the Apocalypse "the seven spirits of God," in Nehemiah "the seven eyes of God," are the seven Amschaspands of the Persian faith. The rebellion and fall of a party of faithless angels are described as minutely by the old Persians as by Milton. The Zend Avesta pictures Ahriman as becoming pregnant and bringing forth Death (*die alte höllenschlange, todschwangere Ahriman*), with as much force as Milton describes the womb of Sin as bearing that fatal monster. The Gahs, or second order of angels, the Persians supposed, were employed in preparing clothing, and laying it up in heaven, to clothe the righteous after the resurrection, — a fancy frequent among the Rabbins, and repeatedly alluded to in the New Testament. With both the Persians and the Jews, all our race, both sexes, sprang from one original man. With both, the first pair were seduced and ruined by means of fruit which the Devil gave to them. With both, there was a belief in demoniacal possessions, devils or bad spirits entering human bodies. With both, there was the

* See Abriss der Religion Zoroasters nach den Zendbüchern, von Abbe Foucher, in Kleuker's Zend Avesta, Band I., Zweit Anhang, Seit. 328-342.

† Schröder, p. 385.

expectation of a great Deliverer, — the Persian Sosiosch, the Jewish Messiah, — whose coming would be preceded by fearful woes, who would triumph over all evil, raise the dead, judge the world, separate the righteous and the wicked, purge the earth with fire, and install a reign of glorious blessedness.* “The conception of an under-world,” says Dr. Röth, “was known centuries before Zoroaster; but probably he was the first to add to the old belief the idea that the under-world was a place of purification, wherein souls were purged from all traces of sin.” † Of this belief in a subterranean purgatory there are numerous unmistakable evidences and examples in the Rabbinical writings. ‡

These notions and others the Pharisees early adopted, and wrought into the texture of what they called the “Oral Law,” that body of verbally transmitted legends, precepts, and dogmas, afterwards written out and collected in the *Mischna*, to which Christ repeatedly alluded with such severity, saying, “Ye by your traditions make the commandments of God of none effect.” To some doctrines of kindred character and origin with these Paul refers, when he warns his readers against “the worshipping of angels,” “endless genealogies,” “philosophy falsely so called,” and various besetting heresies of the time. But others were so woven and assimilated into the substance of the popular Judaism of the age, as inculcated by the Rabbins, that Paul himself held them, the lingering vestiges of his earnest Pharisaic education and organized experience. They naturally found their way into the Apostolic Church, principally composed of Ebionites, Christians who had been Jews; and from it they were never separated, but have come to us in seeming orthodox garb, and are generally retained now. Still they were errors. They are incredible to the thinking minds of to-day. It is best to get rid of them by the truth, that they are pagan growths introduced into

* Die Heiligen Schriften der Parsen, von Dr. F. Spiegel, Kap. II. Seit. 32–37. Studien und Kritiken, 1835, Band I.; “Ist die Lehre von der Auferstehung des Leibes nicht ein alt-Persische Lehre?” F. Nork’s *Mythen der alten Perser als Quellen christlicher Glaubenslehren und Ritualien*.

† Die Zoroastrischen Glaubenslehre, von Dr. Edward Röth, Seite 450.

‡ See, in *Tönn. I. Pars I. Kabbala Denudata, Synopsis Dogmatum Libri Sohar*, pp. 108, 109, 113.

Christianity, but to be discriminated from it. By removing these antiquated and incredible excrescences from the real religion of Christ, we shall save the essential faith, the eternal truth, from the suspicion which their association with it, their fancied identity with it, invites and provokes.

The correspondences between the Persian and the Pharisaic faith are in regard to doctrines of too arbitrary and peculiar a character to allow us for a moment to suppose them to have been an independent product spontaneously developed in the two nations ; though even in that case the doctrines in question have no sanction of authority, not being Mosaic nor Prophetic, but only Rabbinical. One must have received from the other. Which was the bestower and which the recipient is quite plain.* There is not a whit of evidence to show, but, on the contrary, ample presumption to disprove, that a certain cycle of notions were known among the Jews previous to a period of most intimate and constant intercourse between them and the Persians. But before that period those notions were an integral part of the Persian theology, as is confessed by all scholars. Even Prideaux admits that the first Zoroaster lived, and Magianism was flourishing, at least a thousand years before Christ. And the dogmas we refer to are fundamental features of the religion, without which it could not be. These dogmas of the Persians, not derived from the Old Testament nor known among the Jews before the captivity, soon after that time begin to show themselves in their literature, and before the opening of the New Testament are prominent elements of the Pharisaic belief. The inference is unavoidable, that the confluence of Persian thought and feeling with Hebrew thought and feeling, joined with the materials and flowing in the channels of the subsequent experience of the Jews, formed a mingled deposit about the age of Christ, which deposit was Pharisaism. Again, the doctrines common to Zoroastrianism and Pharisaism, in the former seem to be prime sources, in the latter to be late products. In the former, they compose an organic, complete, inseparable system ; in the latter, they are disconnected, mixed piecemeal, and to a considerable

* Lücke's *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Cap. 2, § 8.

extent historically traceable to an origin beyond the native, national mind. It is a significant fact, that the abnormal symbolic beasts described by several of the Jewish prophets, and in the Apocalypse, were borrowed from Persian art. Sculptures representing these have been brought to light by the recent researches at Persepolis. Finally, all early ecclesiastical history uncontestedly shows that Persian dogmas exerted on the Christianity of the first centuries an enormous influence, a pervasive and perverting power unspent yet, and which it is one of the highest tasks of honest and laborious Christian students in the present day to explain, define, and separate. What was that Manichæism which nearly filled Christendom for a hundred years, — what was it, but an influx of tradition, speculation, imagination, and sentiment from Persia? The Gnostic Christians even had a scripture called “Zoroaster’s Apocalypse.”* The “wise men from the east,” who knelt before the infant Christ, “and opened their treasures, and gave him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh,” were Persian Magi. We may imaginatively regard that sacred scene as an emblematical figure of the far other tributes which a little later came from their country to his religion, the unfortunate contributions that permeated and corrupted so much of the form in which it thenceforth appeared and spread. In the pure Gospel’s pristine day, ere it had hardened into theological dogmas, or become encumbered with speculations and comments, from the lips of God’s Anointed Son repeatedly fell the earnest warning, “Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.” There is far more need to have this warning intelligently heeded now, coming with redoubled emphasis from the Master’s own mouth, “Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.” For as the Gospel is generally set forth and received, that leaven has leavened well-nigh the whole lump of it.

W. R. A.

* Kleuker’s *Zend Avesta*, Band II. Anhang I. Seite 12.

ART. III.—UNITARIANISM AND ORTHODOXY ON THE
NATURE AND THE STATE OF MAN.

WE closed a summary review in our last number of a Half-Century of the Unitarian Controversy in Massachusetts, with the statement of three great doctrinal issues around which a protracted and a thorough discussion between the two parties of the old Congregational Church had proved that all their differences now centre. Of course we are not unmindful of the possible suggestion that, as these three doctrinal issues concern the very fundamentals of Christian truth, and decide the opinions held by the respective parties on all other subordinate Christian doctrines, it can hardly be said that the controversy is perceptibly made more simple by being condensed into these terms. It is convenient, however, to avail ourselves of this condensation of terms, even if the simplification of them is only in the seeming. But we feel persuaded that there is a real as well as an apparent step taken towards a better conduct of the controversy when it is thus centred on its main issues. No one can read over the voluminous records of the strife without a conviction that, had the pains and the skill of both parties been spent upon a close and careful discussion of the preliminaries of the controversy, the incidental questions which it opened might have been made to aid in clearing much of its perplexity, instead of serving, as they did, to distract and confound, to irritate and to mislead, many readers on both sides. And after all it is found that the two parties still have bonds of union. They accord in their theories of church institution and organization, against Romanists, Prelatists, and Presbyterians. They cherish many sacred sympathies, memories, and historical associations, precious and venerable to both alike. Alike they cling to the revelation of God by Jesus Christ, to the Scriptures as a rule of faith, and to many common Christian convictions and experiences. They agree, too, upon a great many points of Christian doctrine which the Unitarians regard as, in fact, the fundamentals of Christian doctrine. As, however, these points, which to us are fundamental, though they are also admitted as such by the Orthodox, are by them connected with dis-

puted doctrines, and are sometimes made subsidiary in vital importance to other doctrines, our real accordance in fundamentals with that party passes for but little. But as regards the three doctrines which we have already defined, the two parties are at variance; distinctly and positively opposed to each other. The controversy which commenced in the supposition of a great many other differences, as well as in the recognition of these three, has sunk or harmonized the others, while it has emphasized these. According to the side which any one may espouse on each or all of the three Christian doctrines relating to the Nature and the State of Man, the relation between Christ and God, and the Atonement, will he define his own position as to this controversy.

We now propose to gather up the results of a long discussion, as they bear upon the first of these doctrines.

The first point on which Unitarian sentiment is found to be in positive and entire antagonism with *the standards of Orthodoxy*, is that which concerns the Nature and the State of Men as responsible creatures of God. Let us start with a frank understanding of our ground. Unitarians do not affirm that human beings are born *holy*; nor that the original elements of human nature are free from germs which grow and develop, if unrestrained, into sin; nor that no disadvantage has accrued to all the race of Adam from his disobedience, and from all the accumulations of wickedness that have gathered for ages in the world into which we are introduced. Unitarians do not deny that all men are actually sinners, needing the renewing grace and the forgiveness of God, dependent upon the Gospel of Christ as a remedial and redeeming religion, and having no other hope than that which Christ offers. Unitarians do not deny the great mystery which invests sin and evil, nor profess to have any marked advantage over Orthodoxy in looking back of that mystery or in dealing with it. But Unitarians do deny positively, and with all the earnestness of a sincere and solemn conviction, that the original Calvinistic doctrine (or any subsequent modification of that doctrine which has the authority of an accredited formula with the party) concerning the Nature and the State of Man, is either a Scriptural or a Christian doctrine.

Let it be remembered that we are dealing with a con-

trovery whose present aspect refers us back to its early form and shape if we would judge intelligently of its character. It is essential, therefore, that we define very clearly one of the paramount conditions of the controversy when it opened, in order that we may appreciate its original elements. We have already said that the Unitarians understood and avowed that they were assailing, — not the undefined and modified semblance now called *Orthodoxy*, — but *Calvinism* which had expressed itself in *positive formulas*, and to which the Orthodox party nominally professed an unqualified allegiance. Since the controversy opened, *Orthodoxy*, being restless under each and all of the dogmatic statements in the creed of the three doctrines to which it committed itself, has exhibited its uneasiness in continual efforts to modify and qualify its formulas. Some of its disciples, feeling, precisely as our first Unitarians felt, a shrinking reluctance against the plain literal meaning of the creed, and knowing that they could not accept it as “the Fathers” held it, and yet fearing to commit themselves to our theology, have tried in various ways, with an amazing exercise of ingenuity, to soften and dilute the creed. Especially on this one doctrine of the complete original depravity of human nature have there been endless variations and shadings of opinion. Therefore we must keep in view what the doctrine was, — what it is now in *the creed*, — as defining the doctrine which the Unitarians assailed and denied. The original, substantial Calvinistic doctrine on this point we find, of course, in Calvin’s works, — who received his views essentially from Augustine, — and in the formulas which professedly Calvinistic writers and authorities have advanced.

Professor Norton, in a tract entitled “Thoughts on True and False Religion,” had represented Calvinism as a “religion which teaches that God has formed men so that they are by nature wholly inclined to all moral evil; that he has determined in consequence to inflict upon the greater part of our race the most terrible punishments, and that, unless he has seen fit to place us among the small number of those whom he has chosen out of the common ruin, he will be our eternal enemy and infinite tormentor; that having hated us from our birth, he will continue to exercise upon us for ever his unrelenting

and omnipotent hatred." The writer referred any one who wished to examine this scheme to the Institutes of Calvin, and to the perfected development of it in the works of the Westminster Assembly. Here certainly there could be no question as to what form of *Orthodoxy* Mr. Norton was impugning: it was, distinctively, *Calvinism*.

The *Christian Spectator*, an Orthodox journal published at New Haven, in its number for May and June, 1822, quoted the above language of Mr. Norton, and reflected upon it with extreme severity of tone and epithet, accusing the writer of first *distorting*, and then stigmatizing as blasphemy, doctrines which had been received by a large proportion of intelligent and devout Christians. The reviewer in the *Spectator* added further, that the views portrayed by Mr. Norton had "never been taught or professed extensively, as fundamental doctrines of Christianity: that there never was a sect or body of men, denominated Christian, who would not reject this system as false and injurious, if presented to them as their creed: that there never was an individual author of any celebrity or influence, who ever taught or undertook to defend such doctrines; and that neither 'the Institutes of Calvin,' nor 'the works of the Westminster Assembly,' nor any of the Protestant Confessions of Faith, and, least of all, the confessions of those to whom he intended it should be applied, contain doctrines which are fairly represented by any clause of the foregoing extract."

Mr. Norton, feeling his reputation as an honest man to be insulted by this direct assault upon his integrity, addressed a letter to the editor of the *Christian Spectator*, the insertion of which in the pages of that journal he claimed as his right. In this letter he made a series of quotations from Calvin, from the works of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and from President Edwards, fully and triumphantly proving all his points and disproving those of his reviewer, either by the positive assertions made in these quotations, or by the irresistible inferences to be drawn in perfect fairness from them. We admit that these extracts, when arranged and summed up in their doctrines, present a most shocking portraiture of Calvinism. We do not wonder that an Orthodox

man should shrink from them with mingled feelings of horror and indignation, or that he should avail himself of all the skill of evasive dialectics and subtle metaphysics to find relief.

The editor of the *Spectator* refused to insert this letter, on the ground of its containing some "reproachful and menacing expressions," but promised to publish its substance if these were "purged" out of it. Still, though the editor refused to allow Mr. Norton to address his own reply to the readers of the *Spectator*, he proceeded to make a very imperfect and, unfair representation of the contents of the letter, and, by garbled, partial, and perverted quotations from the authorities in the case, to endeavor to set aside the overwhelming evidence adduced by Mr. Norton in support of his positions. Mr. Norton therefore published his letter, with the remarks of the *Spectator* upon it, in the *Christian Disciple* for July and August, 1822, and added some further comments of his own. The utmost that his reviewer had effected was to show that Calvinistic authorities contained some contradictory and inconsistent passages. Of this fact Mr. Norton, of course, was well aware, but it was no concern of his to disprove it. He convicted his reviewer, however, of absolute misrepresentation in a professed quotation from Calvin; of a poor quibble in applying the words "*creation of nature*" to the divine endowment with which each of us enters upon existence, when Calvin had used them only of the nature created in *Adam*; and of confounding an issue of metaphysics concerning the doctrine of *necessity*. There Mr. Norton left the matter, as well he might.

It is only with pain and regret that at this distance of time a Christian of any denomination can review this episode in the controversy. Candor and justice, however, demand that we record our deep and unrelieved sense of the disingenuousness to which recourse was had on the Orthodox side in this issue. How can there be serious or useful discussion where there is such artifice, such evasion practised in asserting and denying, in shifting one's ground, in disputing the authority of the very *authorities* first appealed to, and in denying the fairest inferences from dogmatic statements? Mark the startling inconsistency between passages from the two

attacks on Mr. Norton in the *Spectator*, as the second of them gives up the very point assumed in the first, and wholly abandons the original ground of the controversy. The *Spectator* first wrote thus: "We are often compelled to complain, that the opponents of Calvinism never fairly attack its doctrines, as they are stated by Calvin himself, or exhibited in the creeds of the churches, or the writings of the authors who bear his name." But after Mr. Norton had given a most scholarly and thorough answer to this plea, the same editorial pen, or authority, which had so recently sanctioned the above statement, was compelled—it is a sad revelation to make—to write or to sanction the following: "What Calvin believed and taught, and what any modern Calvinistic authors have taught, are questions of no real importance in the present discussion, any further than their opinions are proved to be prevalent in our own country." What an astounding inconsistency!

But why,—it may be asked,—why should we hold the Orthodox to the very form of words which was chosen centuries ago to express a doctrine the terms of which have since been modified? We answer, that we do this in order to meet the claims of historical truth and justice, and in order that we may clearly understand that of which we are speaking. The question does not, at this stage of it, concern the qualifications and abatements which in recent years may have been made of this doctrine of Orthodoxy. Unitarianism may or may not oppose these deviations and reductions. But at the opening of the controversy it was the real Calvinistic doctrine which was assailed,—the doctrine of the Westminster Assembly's Catechism which our fathers had accepted,—the doctrine of the New England Confession of Faith, which our churches sent forth in 1680. Fifty years ago the Orthodox began to complain, and they have ever since complained, that Unitarians misrepresented them in charging upon them "in this neighborhood" a shape of Orthodoxy which had been held by Calvinists of a former age, and which survived only in other parts of this country. And here we must be pardoned for giving frank expression to a disagreeable truth. There seems to Unitarians to be something evasive and very unworthy in the pleas with which the Orthodox have met our

exposures of what we regard as the errors of their system. They censure us and deny us the Christian name because we reject their creed; and when, with the best faculties which we possess for analyzing that creed, we attempt to state the reasons why we reject it, they proceed to tell us that they themselves do not hold the creed in what is to us its plain signification. We have endeavored to state fairly its essential doctrines, and the honest, unexaggerated inferences which logically flow from them. But no statement which we can make of the system is ever allowed by the Orthodox to be fair; some private qualifications which they attach to it in their own minds, and of which we have no means of knowing or judging, justify them, as they think, in charging us with misrepresentation. Now some Unitarians, no doubt, have made caricatures of Orthodoxy, and have aimed to load it with offensive, shocking, and blasphemous conditions. These exaggerators of the hideousness of Orthodoxy on our side correspond in temper and spirit, if not in tone, with those among our opponents whose delight is in stating Unitarianism at its *minimum* of every substance and effect, save those of pride and chilliness. But there have been candid and truth-loving men among us, and when such have tried their best to set forth their conceptions of Calvinism at one or more points, indorsing their statements with the testimony as to what had once been taught them and believed by them, the remonstrance was raised, "You are bearing false witness; you are ridiculing us."

Let it therefore be again repeated, Unitarianism opposed and still opposes the Calvinistic doctrine of the entailed corruption of human nature in all our race as the punishment of Adam's guilt. Nor did the Unitarians err in addressing their arguments against that authoritative statement of Calvinism which is given in the Orthodox creeds. The Orthodox wished to have the praise, they claimed the honorable and grateful repute, of "adhering to the faith of the fathers of New England." They claimed also the exclusive inheritance of the old piety, on the score of holding its doctrinal standards. Was not the assertion repeated by them even to weariness, — too often certainly to be regarded as a mere empty boast, — "We hold the doctrines of the Reformation, the doctrines of the fathers of New England"? Now the

Calvinistic doctrines were held heartily and firmly, and without subterfuges of metaphysics, by the fathers of New England. Their professed successors cannot enjoy at the same time the honor of holding their opinions and the privilege of changing them. We are ready to grant to the Orthodox the fullest benefit of all the modifications of this doctrine which the most ingenious man among them is able to devise. But we must urge that these modifications all accrue to our side, as they relax and soften and qualify the sternness of our old foe, and are yielded or availed of for the sake of mitigating the repulsiveness of the original doctrine. When Orthodoxy identifies itself with Calvinism, we, of course, must confront and oppose Calvinism. When Calvinism, with its teeth drawn, and its claws filed, and its horns lowered, and its hoofs covered, has tamed itself down into something called Orthodoxy, we shall first look at the thing from a safe distance, to judge how near it is best to come to it, and with what weapons we must be provided. How long actually it will take Calvinism really to transform itself into an angel of light, it is impossible to say. Time and truth have had a wonderful effect upon its visage, but its old trust-deeds, proclamations, and formulas are unalterable.

Here then is the doctrine which Unitarians understood that they were opposing. We quote from the sixth chapter of the Confession of Faith of the New England Churches.

“God having made a covenant of works and life thereupon, with our first parents, and all their posterity in them, they being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, did wilfully transgress the law of their creation, and break the covenant in eating the forbidden fruit. By this sin they, and we in them, fell from original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root, and by God’s appointment standing in the room and stead of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions. This corruption of nature during this life doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified,

yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin. Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal."

The Shorter Catechism of the Assembly, which also had been formally recognized by our churches, and was taught to all our children, advances the same doctrine on the same grounds, and tells us that "All mankind, by the fall [of Adam], lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell for ever."

We purposely abstain from adding to these authoritative statements of doctrine any quotations from approved Calvinistic writers, which follow it out into its revolting and blasphemous details. We think that the hideous and yet perfectly consistent speculations and representations made by Edwards, to set forth the horrors of hell-torments, the anguish of the reprobate who suffer them, and the exquisite happiness which the "righteous" derive from contemplating them, have done their service in controversy. It only aggravates our opponents if we renew those fearful delineations. We are content to follow the doctrine as nakedly presented in the formula. This is the doctrine which by profession one hundred years ago, and in sober sincerity two hundred years ago, underlaid the theology — the Calvinistic, the Orthodox theology — of New England. It was made the starting-point of the Christian system. It decided the terms of relation and duty, of accountability, judgment, and doom, in which men stood to God. It was made to establish the necessity and the method of redemption by an infinite sacrifice to God, designed to serve as a substitute with God for the sufferings of men. When Unitarians brought this doctrine into prominence, and made its positive, literal assertions, and the legitimate logical inferences from them, a ground for repudiating such theology, an alternative was presented to the Orthodox party. It offered them a choice between two honest and manly methods of pursuing the controversy in allegiance to simple truth, and with an entire security against those odious passions and

recriminations which entered into it. The one method would have held them to a candid allowance that they were pledged to that doctrine, with all the legitimate logical inferences which of course must be admitted to result from it as the basis of a system; and to a resolute, unswerving, and unabashed support of it against all opposition. The other method would have dictated to them to state frankly any abatement or qualification under which they might wish to accept the doctrine, and to insist upon their right so to modify it, and to be made answerable for only a mitigated form of the doctrine. But instead of following either of these methods, the disputants on the Orthodox side endeavored to devise a third method, fashioned from some of the proper elements of the other two, yet lacking, in our judgment, the candor and truthfulness of both of them. A *profession* was made of holding in all loyalty and confidence the faith of the Fathers; a *confession* was very reluctantly drawn out, that that faith was accepted only through certain undefined abatements made of it by a new philosophy of doctrine. We have read much of the controversial literature of the half-century, but we have not met with one single page which boldly meets the real issue opened by such a plea for Calvinism as would have been offered two hundred years ago. The very best proof possible that Orthodoxy did not at least understand the ground it had undertaken to occupy, and was consequently in danger of putting at risk and yielding something of what it was trying to defend, is offered us in the following curious fact,—that, in conducting the controversy with us, Orthodoxy opened controversies in its own ranks that have never yet been decided or pacified. “The Spirit of the Pilgrims” was established to do battle with Unitarians. But just midway in its series of volumes, the reader will find that it allowed us a breathing spell, while it occupied its pages with the doctrinal contentions in its own household, which at once arose when Orthodoxy undertook its own defence. Drs. Taylor, Tyler, Beecher, and Woods address each other, as well as ourselves, in those pages.

Dr. Woods, who aimed for candor and courtesy in his argument, realized the necessity of making a distinct avowal on this point; and he was the first writer of ability

on his side who yielded to the pressure of the Unitarian exposition of Calvinism by itself. He therefore wrote as follows: "If there is any principle respecting the moral government of God which the Orthodox clergy in New England earnestly labor to inculcate, it is this: that, as accountable beings, *we have a conscience and a power of knowing and performing our duty.* Our zeal in defence of this principle has been such as to occasion no small umbrage to some, who are attached to every feature and every phraseology of Calvinism. On this subject there is, in fact, a well-known difference between our views, and those of some modern, as well as more ancient divines, who rank high on the side of Orthodoxy." * How those who, according to the creed just quoted, are "wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body," and "disabled, and made opposite to all good," have still "a power of knowing and performing their duty," Dr. Woods does not attempt to show. The difference, therefore, by his own statement, between those who held his views, and the true Calvinists, is, that he tried to hold to Calvinism and to something utterly inconsistent with Calvinism. No wonder that "zeal in defence of this principle" occasioned "no small umbrage."

Thus it was that, the moment a decided opposition was raised by Unitarians to this Calvinistic doctrine, those who came forward to vindicate it began to evade its full force. They shrank from facing it; they shrink from it now: they try to soften it. A hair's breadth of relief from the pressure of the doctrine has been held as a blessing by those who have argued in its defence. We might try to present here a series of the ingenious or futile, the actual or only apparent modifications, and attempted modifications, of this Calvinistic doctrine. But some of them are unintelligible to ourselves, and others of them which we think we understand we know we could not make intelligible to our readers. By and by we must refer to some of them. We must not, however, leave an impression that, singly or together, they give much relief. They are of service to us, as showing a constant uneasiness under any form by which the old doctrine has as yet been presented, and as indicating how

* Letters to Unitarians, p. 130.

trifling a relaxation of its old terms will be welcomed as a comfort.

The doctrine still stands, however, unchanged in word, unrelaxed in authority, in the formulas of Orthodox churches. Still is the repute of holding the faith of the Fathers claimed by those who are called Orthodox. The Westminster Catechism and Confession are the standards of the American Presbyterian Church. The Confession is the doctrinal foundation of the Saybrook Platform, which was re-adopted by the General Association of Connecticut in 1810. The Reformed Dutch Church uses the Confession of Faith of the Synod of Dort, which certainly does not soften this one Calvinistic doctrine. We know, too, that those who formed and phrased these standards held this doctrine with an unflinching steadfastness, in the boldness and fearlessness of which they seem even to have found a trifle of merit on their own part, while they never shrank from the most unrelieved statement of the doctrine. And this is the doctrine which Unitarianism rejected, positively, and without qualification, concession, or tolerance; asserting that it is not taught in the Bible, but is utterly inconsistent with the teachings of that book; that it dishonors God by ascribing to him a method arbitrary, unjust, and wholly subversive of all righteous law; that it wrongs human nature, destroys moral responsibility, corrupts the Christian system, unsettles morality, and leads to infidelity and irreligion. This is the ground of opposition, and these are the terms of it which Unitarianism recognized at the opening of the controversy. Unitarianism has held its ground without misgiving or compromise. Unitarianism means to hold its ground, — no more and no less than its ground, — on this matter of doctrine. Its courage and assurance and confidence have steadily increased, as it has realized its own strength and the weakness of its antagonist on this doctrine of the entail on all the human race, on account of the sin of one man, of a corrupted nature, which must work corruption in this life, and which is sentenced to the torments of hell for ever.

When the human mind calmly and deliberately, without bias, but with all the seriousness of which it is capable, brings itself to confront that doctrine, two great tests will present themselves for trying its truth. How does it

consist with faith in a God of adorable attributes, a Being of infinite wisdom, power, and benevolence? How has the preaching of it affected the great mass of those to whom it has been taught, in persuading them to believe it, and in impressing them with any sense of its appalling significance corresponding to its terrific threatenings? It is impossible for any active mind to repress its own instinctive impulse to apply these two great tests to the doctrine. Indeed, the irresistible evidence furnished by any fair inquiry through the second test, as it presents us with matters of practical experience, is so conclusive against this doctrine, that we are content with simply asserting, without any argument, that the doctrine cannot abide the first test. The utter unconcern, the blank sense of unreality, with which the vast mass of human beings have heard that doctrine preached and taught, has proved it to be in fact but little better than a bugbear. It is to be remembered that our churches here were constituted at first of men and women who had been *picked out* as already believers of the doctrine; but as soon as they had descendants, and the increase of population had brought society into that state of mixed and various elements which is natural under ordinary circumstances, the doctrine became a fable to a larger number of persons than those to whom it was a truth. Indeed, the preaching of the doctrine never excited the dread in any one of our communities which attended merely the apprehension of a visitation of the small-pox. But, in the mean while, what was the influence of the theoretical truth and authority of this doctrine upon all the best interests of religion among us? It caused an untold amount of unbelief and indifference and irreligion.

Consider, now, how appalling and crushing is this old Calvinistic dogma. God fashioned this globe as the habitation of a race of his own intelligent creatures, of beings made in his likeness and gifted with his inspiration. God then staked the issue as to the nature, the character, the experience, and the doom of all the uncounted millions to be born here "by ordinary generation," through all ages, upon a single act of the first pair who represented humanity on this fresh earth. God was thwarted in his purpose at the very start. His first two

children acted for all his children, and by the deed of a moment, instigated not by any evil inclination of their own, — for by the theory they were created *holy*, — but by the subtlety of a wicked spirit, consigned themselves and all their posterity to the dread pit of torments. Human reason instantly suggests, if God was so early thwarted in his plan because the constitution of those two beings, with their state of exposure to Satan, brought them so instantaneously to ruin, why did he not at once cut short the growth from a corrupted stock, forbid the mischief to extend even into one more generation, and create a second pair? If the doctrine be true, we enter upon life at a dreadful disadvantage. As the famous Dr. Bellamy frankly affirmed, in full consistency with his creed, "Mankind were by their fall [meaning by *their*, Adam's] brought into a state of being *infinitely worse than not to be*."* We as frankly own, that Unitarians can say nothing worse of this doctrine than one of its own defenders said of it in that sentence. And yet we should even now be met with the old charge of misrepresentation, if by way of construction and inference from that assertion we should say, that Dr. Bellamy admitted that all the power which God has exerted in the creation of all human beings since the first two, has resulted in something infinitely worse than would have been a perfect blank of non-existence. Our patrimony is all spent. The portion of our father's goods which would have fallen to us was all squandered by our eldest brother. Scripture tells us that there is a curse upon the fields of our labor; but Calvin has gone beyond the Scripture, which cursed neither Adam nor Eve, and has taught us that there is a curse upon the soul of every infant, even while it is in the womb. The prospect, the hope, the elating, spurring motive of a possible charm and blessing in existence, is destroyed for us by a foregone conclusion at our birth. Tell a young man, in the prime of his manhood, that, as his father died leaving unpaid debts, he must give up all the fruits of his own toil till those debts are discharged, and the buoyancy of youth and a filial sentiment may perhaps bear him cheerfully through the sacrifice. Tell a young man, that his father was bound

* Works, Vol. I. p. 333.

at his death by an unfulfilled contract, and manly honor may induce the son to complete it. Or tell that young man, that his deceased parent died in a penitentiary where he had spent but half of the years for which he was sentenced, and that he, the son, must go in and serve out the sentence. Possibly, even then, a loyalty to the laws of a community, which, as they secure to a son his father's property, might also impose a father's obligations, might induce the son to acquiesce uncomplainingly in the hard exaction. But tell us, all who live, or ever have lived, or ever shall live, of the race of Adam, that we accede to the obligations of one of his debts which there is no paying by all our labors, — that we are held to a contract which we never have made, and which God, one of the parties to it, has discharged himself from keeping according to its original terms with us, whom he has nevertheless compelled to be the other party to it, — and that while we are yet in the womb a transfer is made to us of an endless sentence in the pit of hell; — tell us all this, and what heart of man, what hope, what faith, can face it, as the appointment of a just God? A child has to be taught that doctrine. And what a lesson it is for father or mother to teach to a child, — to teach, too, as a doctrine of the Bible, the will of God!

We read in that Bible of Jehovah and of Baal. The book leaves us at perfect liberty, — indeed, it asks us *to choose* either of those beings as our God. By what ground of choice do we take Jehovah, and not Baal, for our Deity, to believe in, to worship, to love? Our choice is not decided by the words, the names, applied to the one or the other of those deities, but by the character, the dealings, the purposes, ascribed to each of them. We choose the ONE who is to be loved, to be revered, because of his holiness, his justice, his righteousness, his benignity. And so reason enters its protest against that doctrine. For there is a certain test principle within us, call it reason, judgment, or by whatever name we will, which we must apply at least in first accepting the Bible on the score of what it contains. There is no denying that reason, the highest gift of God to us, is shocked by that doctrine. Even the defenders of the doctrine allow this. Dr. Dwight says, "Perhaps no doctrine is more reluc-

tantly received by the human mind."* Even if the doctrine were plainly and positively taught in a Bible, the issue would then be, Does that Bible authenticate the doctrine? or, Does that doctrine disprove and nullify the claims of the Bible? We feel no hesitation in affirming, that a Bible which advanced that doctrine would divest itself of the first and all-essential proof from its contents that it came from inspiration of God, and would throw upon all the other elements of such proof a burden which it is almost inconceivable that they could bear.

Below this and all similar discussions as to Scripture doctrine, lies a question, which, although it may be uncandidly and unfairly presented or arrayed, must be honorably allowed its full pertinence and propriety; namely, Does the system of doctrine taught in the Bible conform itself to, or outrage, the highest and purest exercise of the natural abilities which God has given to his creatures for interpreting a revelation from him? Are we driven to the alternative of living wholly without God, without faith, or of conforming our faith to a shocking and unreasonable representation of God and his ways? Does the Bible teach such a scheme as those who wish to have its help in a right and holy life can accept? If it does not, it will be classed with the Shasters, the Vedas, and the Koran. Theologians of all parties and sects may assure themselves that this is henceforward the real issue on trial before the world. And the parties for trying that issue are not a few classes of theological students, trained under professional influences, made to cramp the natural processes of their minds by subtle metaphysical speculations, and taught to infuse the pure zeal of earnest hearts for evangelizing the world into a strained allegiance to a creed which the heart repudiates. No! Not one in a score of those whom Orthodoxy addresses with this dogma accepts it, believes it, or does otherwise than loathe it. Let Orthodoxy regard, before it is too late, that trial of its dogmas which the other nineteen out of every twenty of those who listen to it are making. Dr. Woods says: "Without supposing that Unitarians have a preconceived opinion which they wish to support, I am not able to account for it, that they

* Sermon XXIX.

should interpret the word of God as they do."* It is even so. Unitarians, we are free to confess, have a *preconceived opinion*, though it is by no means confined to avowed Unitarians. It is only by and through the help of that *preconceived opinion* that we are able or disposed to take the first step towards receiving the Bible as in any sense "the word of God," and not the word of Baal. The *preconceived opinion* which we possess and exercise is just as much a revelation from God as anything that Prophet or Apostle ever wrote; and revelation was given to add something more to it, not to mock and outrage and deny it. The same Andover theologian, in addressing Unitarians previously (Letter IV.) had written: "We have nothing to do with the question, how the common doctrine of depravity can consist with the moral perfection of God." But, it may be asked, in what way, through what means and processes, are we persuaded of "the moral perfection of God"? Certainly not through a doctrine which is utterly inconsistent with all the instincts and perceptions which God has given us. Would Dr. Woods maintain, that we have the means of assuring to ourselves the perfection of the Deity, wholly apart from the study of his methods in nature and revelation? Would he maintain, that by these supposed means we can so convince ourselves of that sublime truth, that no amount of injustice or cruelty attributed to God would either shake our faith in him, or bring into doubt the record of an alleged revelation which so impugned his equity? The *methods* of the Divine government cannot be distinguished so positively from the *attributes* of the Deity, as to leave our confidence in his moral perfection unimpaired by the slightest deviation from absolute equity in his dealings with us.

The question will naturally present itself to many minds, How have men ever been made able or willing to accept this doctrine? How have they overcome the shrinking reluctance of their own reason at a doctrine which they supposed was taught in the Bible? Why did they not rather discredit the Bible, than accept the doctrine? Much might be said in reply to this question. If we had space and motive for its thorough discussion, we should raise a doubt whether the doctrine ever had

* Works, Vol. IV. p. 271.

been really and intensely believed by any large number of intelligent persons. We are aware that this assertion will provoke one of those positive, protesting affirmations, that millions of pious Christians have heartily believed the doctrine. We are willing to admit that they thought they believed it. But this is very far from satisfying us that all, or even the larger part, of those who have nominally professed to hold this doctrine, have ever grasped and wrestled with its appalling horrors, and, after stoutly and intelligently pursuing it by the logic of its antecedents and its consequences, have yielded to an entire persuasion that it is the truth of God. If it be said that millions of the believers in the Molochs and Juggernauts of heathenism have held, without misgiving, doctrines of a similar character concerning their gods, we reply that there is an unspeakable difference between the two classes of believers, — the Christian and the heathen, — as indicated by *the whole* of their respective religions. Heathenism is self-consistent. Its doctrines harmonize with each other, and one who accepts a portion of them can accept the rest. But a Christian who professes to believe this doctrine, that a corrupted nature, which dooms us all to unending torments, has been entailed upon us by ordinary generation on account of the sin of Adam, is compelled to receive it in connection with Scripture doctrines of the Divine justice and benignity, and of human individuality in duty and responsibility, which are totally and irreconcilably inconsistent with it. So we infer that his *belief* must necessarily be mistrustful, wavering, and not fully assured. Whether the fact that most, if not all, of the men and women who have professed to believe this doctrine have had the effort of belief facilitated to them by the assurance that, through some remedial process of free grace, they had been delivered personally from the terrific sweep of the doctrine, is a suggestion which we do not care to follow out. Any one who could believe this doctrine concerning all his race the more readily, because, without any merit of his own, he was rescued from its eternal sentence, would be a monster of selfishness.

Those who have professed and have tried, successfully or otherwise, to believe this doctrine, have held it on the ground of the "sovereignty of God." They have referred it to the dread and irresistible prerogative

of that Being who has a right to fashion clay to honor or to dishonor, to do what he will and as he will with his creatures, and who doubtless will be able to vindicate *his justice*, even to those who call it *injustice*. In stern loyalty to that view of the sovereignty of God, sincere and pious men and women have choked down the risings of a spirit rebelling against this doctrine.

It is plain that only the most positive authority and the most explicit testimony could lead us even to entertain such a doctrine as having a claim on our thoughts. It is but little to say that the authority, the testimony adduced for the doctrine, are totally inadequate to sustain it. The evidence adduced for it from the Scriptures is essentially drawn from a single passage in the Old Testament, and a single passage in the New Testament. There are indeed many sentences scattered over the Bible which are alleged as incidentally confirming and illustrating the doctrine. But its intelligent believers will not deny that, were it not for the two passages which are supposed explicitly to assert it, the doctrine would not be claimed as a Bible doctrine.

The first of these two passages is the narrative in the Book of Genesis, of the creation, the sin, and the punishment of Adam. Even if we interpret that narrative in the most rigidly literal manner, we cannot find in it the faintest intimation of the doctrine of the Westminster Catechism. Not one word is said in the narrative to imply that the sin of Adam passed over to his own children even, much less to all his posterity. It is not asserted that his act of sin corrupted his own *nature* even, much less the nature with which God, for all time to come, would endow his posterity. What a stupendous interpolation does the creed force into the record, in its positive, but most false assertion, that Adam was acting for all his posterity, and that he "stood in the room and stead of all mankind," and that *death for him* means *eternal torments for all his race* ! There is not a word of it in the record. Adam is addressed as an individual, acting by himself and for himself alone, and for no one except or beyond himself. "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not," is the emphatic announcement of his own unshared obligation and responsibility. The most literal interpretation of the record confutes the creed. But no one — no, not a

single intelligent reader—confines himself to a strictly literal interpretation of that narrative. Whatever be the religious opinions of such a reader, he sees at once that some allowance, more or less, must be made for the Oriental imagery, the figures of speech, the rhetoric and the drapery, of that concise record of a far-off age. All interpreters make such allowances,—not the same allowances, indeed, in matter and degree, but some allowances; they all depart from the letter of the narrative, and explain it constructively and inferentially, the question between interpreters being, Which explanation is the right one?

Every just and consistent claim of that narrative is met when we regard it as giving a sketch of the workings and the experiences of humanity on this earth, in an allegorical representation, by which an individual is made to stand as a type of us all. *Adam* is and means *Man*, and Adam's experience is representative of the experience of all human beings. We are all created as he was. Human nature works in us as it worked in him. We sin as he sinned; we suffer as he suffered; we die as he died. We do not sin *because* he sinned, but *as* he sinned; *in like manner*, since we have a like nature. We do not *suffer* because *he sinned*, but because we ourselves sin. The narrative teaches us that a being constituted as we are,—a type of humanity on the earth,—with our endowments and limitations of nature, our balanced powers and infirmities, subjected to the tenure and the exposures of life here, would be capable of sinning and liable to sin,—that he would sin, and that his sin would subject him to labor and sorrow and death. This is the solemn, yet not unreasonable, doctrine of the narrative. It is sufficiently serious and overshadowing in the dismay and awe which it casts over us. Yet we accept the lesson in all its solemnity, and would not trifle with a letter which is used in conveying it to us. It would be invested with an unrelieved gloom to us, did not the narrative immediately connect with this typical representation of the workings of the experiment of humanity, the promise of continued aid, and of mercy and blessing and redemption from God. So far is the narrative from asserting that the personal sin of Adam entailed a vitiated nature on his posterity, that it expressly tells us that

one of the two sons of Adam was righteous and approved of God. But supposing even that the original human stock had been corrupted in Adam, the flood was designed to secure a new and purified stock, and the progenitor in that hope, in whom it is written that the world had a new start, was "righteous Noah," while all human beings, save himself and his family, were cut off. It is written, "Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations; and Noah walked with God." (Genesis vi. 9.) His family started afresh, with a new blessing from God: "And God blessed Noah and his sons." Why then, if *character* is propagated from a parent, — why did not Noah propagate a pure stock?

That one narrative of Adam in and out of Paradise is the only passage in the Old Testament which can be alleged as recognizing in any way our connection with his personal sin or *Fall*. Not another sentence, not another line in all the elder Scriptures, ever makes the slightest reference to the subject. No oracle, vision, chronicle, proverb, or psalm recognizes the doctrine. Not a single one of the inspired prophets of the Almighty to the Jews ever uttered, so far as we know, one word implying that Adam acted for all his posterity, ruined us all in his fall, and so foreclosed the trial of existence for all who should ever live. Is not this an amazing fact, — that those sacred oracles should be so dumbly silent about a matter which is said to underlie the whole doctrinal teaching of revelation!

One passage in the New Testament furnishes all the substantial authority which the Gospel is supposed to give to this doctrine. Not a word, however, can be quoted from the Saviour's lips in recognition, still less as an assertion, of the doctrine. The passage referred to is not from the teaching of Christ, but from an argumentative letter of St. Paul. In the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, we read an illustrative comment on the narrative in Genesis, — not a new revelation of doctrine. We find nothing in the Apostle's statement which conflicts with, but, on the contrary, everything to favor, the view we have already derived from the earlier record. If in the peculiar style or method of the Apostle's reasoning he may seem to imply more than the record conveys from which he quotes, that is a trace of a habit of his which the intelligent interpreter of his writings meets

single intelligent reader — confines himself to a strictly literal interpretation of that narrative. Whatever be the religious opinions of such a reader, he sees at once that some allowance, more or less, must be made for the Oriental imagery, the figures of speech, the rhetoric and the drapery, of that concise record of a far-off age. All interpreters make such allowances, — not the same allowances, indeed, in matter and degree, but some allowances; they all depart from the letter of the narrative, and explain it constructively and inferentially, the question between interpreters being, Which explanation is the right one?

Every just and consistent claim of that narrative is met when we regard it as giving a sketch of the workings and the experiences of humanity on this earth, in an allegorical representation, by which an individual is made to stand as a type of us all. *Adam* is and means *Man*, and Adam's experience is representative of the experience of all human beings. We are all created as he was. Human nature works in us as it worked in him. We sin as he sinned; we suffer as he suffered; we die as he died. We do not sin *because* he sinned, but *as* he sinned; *in like manner*, since we have a like nature. We do not *suffer* because *he sinned*, but because we ourselves sin. The narrative teaches us that a being constituted as we are, — a type of humanity on the earth, — with our endowments and limitations of nature, our balanced powers and infirmities, subjected to the tenure and the exposures of life here, would be capable of sinning and liable to sin, — that he would sin, and that his sin would subject him to labor and sorrow and death. This is the solemn, yet not unreasonable, doctrine of the narrative. It is sufficiently serious and overshadowing in the dismay and awe which it casts over us. Yet we accept the lesson in all its solemnity, and would not trifle with a letter which is used in conveying it to us. It would be invested with an unrelieved gloom to us, did not the narrative immediately connect with this typical representation of the workings of the experiment of humanity, the promise of continued aid, and of mercy and blessing and redemption from God. So far is the narrative from asserting that the personal sin of Adam entailed a vitiated nature on his posterity, that it expressly tells us that

one of the two sons of Adam was righteous and approved of God. But supposing even that the original human stock had been corrupted in Adam, the flood was designed to secure a new and purified stock, and the progenitor in that hope, in whom it is written that the world had a new start, was "righteous Noah," while all human beings, save himself and his family, were cut off. It is written, "Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations; and Noah walked with God." (Genesis vi. 9.) His family started afresh, with a new blessing from God: "And God blessed Noah and his sons." Why then, if *character* is propagated from a parent, — why did not Noah propagate a pure stock?

That one narrative of Adam in and out of Paradise is the only passage in the Old Testament which can be alleged as recognizing in any way our connection with his personal sin or *Fall*. Not another sentence, not another line in all the elder Scriptures, ever makes the slightest reference to the subject. No oracle, vision, chronicle, proverb, or psalm recognizes the doctrine. Not a single one of the inspired prophets of the Almighty to the Jews ever uttered, so far as we know, one word implying that Adam acted for all his posterity, ruined us all in his fall, and so foreclosed the trial of existence for all who should ever live. Is not this an amazing fact, — that those sacred oracles should be so dumbly silent about a matter which is said to underlie the whole doctrinal teaching of revelation!

One passage in the New Testament furnishes all the substantial authority which the Gospel is supposed to give to this doctrine. Not a word, however, can be quoted from the Saviour's lips in recognition, still less as an assertion, of the doctrine. The passage referred to is not from the teaching of Christ, but from an argumentative letter of St. Paul. In the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, we read an illustrative comment on the narrative in Genesis, — not a new revelation of doctrine. We find nothing in the Apostle's statement which conflicts with, but, on the contrary, everything to favor, the view we have already derived from the earlier record. If in the peculiar style or method of the Apostle's reasoning he may seem to imply more than the record conveys from which he quotes, that is a trace of a habit of his which the intelligent interpreter of his writings meets

with in other places in his Epistles. His words are: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." And this is saying, *not* that we all sin because our progenitor sinned, *nor* that we all die because he sinned, but that, as the first man was a sinner and a mortal, so we are all sinners and all mortal; not because of a corrupt nature, but because of a human nature.

Yet it is said that this doctrine of a disabled nature entailed upon us by ordinary generation finds support in the whole system of revealed truth. We affirm that it is wholly and at every point inconsistent with that system, and with each of the doctrinal elements that enter into it. It is not consistent with the attributes of God, as Wise, and Good, and Righteous. To say that his whole scheme was thwarted, and that one lapse of one individual ruined a race of beings, and visited upon the unborn in endless succession the guilt of a sin to which they were not parties, — to say this, will not harmonize with the character of God. Some Orthodox writers have presumed that they involved Unitarians in a dilemma, by reminding us, that, though we assert that this doctrine of *native depravity* is not consistent with justice in our Creator, we still have to admit that the existence of Evil is consistent with the attributes of that Being. But we do not recognize the dilemma. The allowance of evil may be a means of good for all men, but native depravity must insure the ruin of untold millions. Dr. Woods* speaks of "that vulgar charge, which contains too much apparent truth to be directly denied, and yet too much falsehood to be admitted, that we [the Orthodox] represent men to be as God made them, incapable of any good till renewed by *irresistible* influence, irreversibly appointed to destruction without any regard to their sins." We will not use the word *quibble* in connection with anything that *seemed* like an argument to Dr. Woods. We must say, however, that the Westminster creed asserts literally, positively, and fully of God, all that Dr. Woods here repudiates. The loophole for escape, however, lies in this plea, — that when we are born into this world we are not what *God* made us, but what *Adam* made us.

* Works, Vol. IV. pp. 335, 336.

Again, this doctrine is inconsistent with what revelation teaches of the nature of man, as a free, moral, and accountable being, capable of good and evil, living in individual responsibility, never bearing the iniquity even of his nearest in kin, nor having his teeth set on edge because his father had eaten sour grapes. It is inconsistent, too, with the purpose of life, as an opportunity, a gift, a fair trial, an unprejudiced experiment, and not a foregone conclusion to each and every human being. The doctrine is inconsistent at every point with the Christian scheme. The Calvinistic system, which teaches this doctrine, expressly affirms that the Gospel of Christ does not save all men. So, according to this doctrine, the Christian remedy is not equal to meeting the disease entailed upon our race. Adam did more of harm to our race than Christ can do of benefit. God — for in the Calvinistic scheme Christ is God — cannot wholly undo for the innocent the mischief wrought upon them by one of his own creatures! Well may the modern Calvinist object to *inferences* from his doctrine, however rigidly fair the logic by which they are drawn. Now St. Paul says that the free gift of Redemption from God by Christ is *more*, instead of *less*, than the offence of sin by Adam; that grace *exceeds*, rather than *falls short* of the occasion for it. "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," is the Apostle's emphatic statement. But it cannot be true in an economy under which a human being entails sin and ruin upon his whole race, while a Divine Being — the Redeemer — rescues only a portion of that race. "Not as the offence," says St. Paul, "so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." (Romans v. 15.) But is it so by the Calvinistic scheme? Look at it and see. Adam brought ruin upon every one of his posterity. "The guilt of his sin is imputed, and corrupted nature conveyed to all by ordinary generation," says the creed. Adam, then, made shipwreck of the race. Christ saves individuals here and there. The first pair could communicate their corrupted nature to unborn millions; but Christian parents, regenerated, purified, and sanctified by Christ, cannot communicate their renewed nature to a single one in a large

family of their own children. It would be difficult, with such a theology as this, to calculate by how much the free gift is *less* than the offence. But our Orthodox brethren must devise a more subtle philosophy than they have yet invented, to rectify the loss on their side of the balance by the excess on the Apostle's side. We cannot but conclude that this doctrine, instead of being conformed to the Christian system, is in utter discordance with it. Sin has come in like an ocean tide, bearing all before it; the Orthodox Gospel saves only here and there a wreck from the dreary wastes of woe.

We must now fix our attention for a moment upon one of the most odious features of this doctrine, because it was there that the struggle against it was concentrated by its opponents, and its professed believers began their attempts at modifying it. Observe in the creed the assertion made as positively and literally as language will allow, that a corrupted nature is conveyed, by ordinary generation, to all of Adam's posterity, in consequence of his personal sin. To an ingenuous mind this assertion can convey but one idea. The lamentable shifts and evasions and subtilties to which Orthodox theologians have had recourse during the last half-century, in trying to evade the plain meaning of this article of their creed, are a scandal upon our whole profession. That we ought to expect a long and sad reckoning to be visited upon us, in a widely diffused unbelief, a distrust of religious teaching, and a general and dismal sense of unreality about theological dogmas, is but a looking for a retribution, the tokens of which are too evident to be disputed. If this Orthodox doctrine is not a most shameful trifling with solemnities, as well as with language, it asserts that, by the constitution and appointment of God, the one man Adam had the power to communicate a vitiated nature, like an hereditary disease, not merely to the bodies, but to the souls, of all human beings, and that the possession of that vitiated nature disables us for anything good, and inclines us to all evil, involving us all in guilt, and dooming us all to woe. This doctrine either contradicts truth and reason, in affirming that any one can be a partaker in sin committed before his birth, or it contradicts justice and righteousness, by subjecting us to punishment for the offence of another. Now the doctrine

of a *sinful nature* being propagated by bodily descent, like an hereditary disease, is the most outrageous and malignant form of materialism ever devised. It makes *man*, instead of *God*, to be "the *Father of Spirits*." And what is the meaning of the phrase, a *sinful nature*? Does not this assign to nature what can be assigned only to *character*? Would Orthodoxy persuade us that we create our own *nature*? Would Orthodoxy transfer from God to Adam the office of endowing human souls? Character exhibits moral qualities, and within the range of its freedom involves responsibility; but *nature* is an original limitation and confine within which there is no responsibility. A sinful action is a possibility, a sinful nature is an impossibility.

An episode in the controversy upon the Scripture doctrine concerning the nature and the state of man, related to the doom of those who died in infancy. We must make some reference to this episode, though it must needs be brief.

The Christian Disciple for May and June, 1823, had quoted the following sentences from Dr. Twiss, Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly: "In regard to those who are condemned to eternal death solely on account of original sin, their condemnation to eternal death is the consequence of Adam's transgression alone. But many infants depart this life in original sin, and consequently are condemned to eternal death on account of original sin alone; therefore the *condemnation of many* INFANTS TO ETERNAL DEATH is the consequence of Adam's transgression *solely*." "Adam's sin is made ours by the imputation of God; so that it has exposed INNUMERABLE INFANTS to DIVINE WRATH, who were guilty of this sin, AND OF NO OTHER." "There,"—adds the Disciple,—“we ask whether any Unitarian ever attempted to color or exaggerate a doctrine like this,—a doctrine taught in so many words by the Prolocutor of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and by a thousand others,—a doctrine, moreover, which follows necessarily from the Calvinistic system, and which would now be insisted on by all real and consistent Calvinists, if they thought their people would bear it?” (p. 220.) In an earlier volume of the same periodical had occurred this sentence: “We suspect that Orthodox congregations are less accustomed

than formerly, to hear of infants being justly liable to the eternal pains of hell."* Dr. Lyman Beecher, in a note to the seventh edition, published in 1827, of a sermon originally preached and printed in 1808, repelled as a calumny the charge that Calvinists believe and teach "the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned." He asserted among other things, that, having lived fifty years, "and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, he had never seen nor heard of any book which contained such a sentiment." He added: "And I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons who have been accustomed to propagate this slander, that they commit to memory without delay the ninth commandment, which is, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'" The *Christian Examiner* (Vol. IV. p. 431, for 1837) boldly took up the implied challenge of Dr. Beecher, and positively affirmed that "the doctrine of infant damnation has been expressly maintained by leading Calvinists, and is connected with essential, vital principles of the Calvinistic system." Then followed a series of articles in the *Examiner*, and a series of letters by Dr. Beecher in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, in exchange, not exactly of *courtesies*, but of arguments and testimonies, and of what were designed for arguments and testimonies, on either side of the issue thus opened. To say, as in the spirit of perfect candor and full sincerity we are compelled to say, that Dr. Beecher was utterly and most ingloriously vanquished, and that his opponent gained a complete and unquestionable victory, — to say this, while it affords us no pleasure whatever, may be accounted as only a partisan boast on our part. If any one is inclined to judge, not us, but our decision or opinion on this matter, we will be content with receiving his promise that he will read the articles referred to in the fourth and fifth volumes of the *Christian Examiner*. Never, in our judgment, was there a more fair, or thorough, or exhaustive, or decisive course of argument, authenticated at every point, brought to sustain an assumed position in a matter of controversy, than may be found in those papers. The utmost that Dr. Beecher could be induced to admit sustained only the assertion

* *Christian Disciple* for 1819, p. 279.

already quoted by us from the Christian Disciple, that Calvinism taught "that infants are justly liable to the pains of hell." He acknowledged that, according to his creed, "infants, by the imputation of Adam's sin, are depraved and guilty, and on this account children of wrath, and exposed justly to future punishment."* He admitted it also to be a doctrine of Calvinism, according to Turretin, "that infants *deserve* damnation, because, though not subjects of law as regards *action*, they are as regards *disposition*." We should have been fully content to have accepted these admissions as a complete warrant for the assertion that the doctrine of infant damnation "is connected with vital, essential principles of the Calvinistic system." The essence of the horrifying imputation which Calvinism casts upon the Creator consists rather in ascribing to him the making of dying infants *liable* to the doom of hell, than in positively affirming that any infants suffer that doom. The Westminster Catechism and the New England Confession tell us that "*Elect* infants dying in infancy are saved by Christ." But all the reserved and implied difference which there is between *infants* and *elect* infants is certainly suggestive of a class of *non-elect* infants, and if the distinction in the terms secures salvation to the *elect*, it intimates perdition for the *non-elect*, "dying in infancy."

If, besides drawing out these Orthodox allowances and implications, Unitarianism had wished to repel the charge of having invented this calumny against Orthodoxy or Calvinism, a very few quotations like the following from writers not on the Unitarian side would have sufficed.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor writes thus: "Gregorius Ariminensis, Driedo, Luther, Melancthon, and Tilmanus Heshusius, are fallen into the worst of St. Austin's [Augustine's] opinion, and sentence poor infants to the flames of hell for original sin, if they die before baptism."†

Rev. Thomas Stackhouse writes thus: "The Calvinists carry the matter much farther [than the Schoolmen], asserting that original sin (besides an exclusion from heaven) deserves the punishment of *damnation*; and therefore they conclude that such infants as die unbaptized, and are

* Spirit of the Pilgrims, Vol. I. p. 46.

† Heber's Taylor, Vol. IX. p. 91.

not of the number of the *elect* (which have always a particular exemption), are, for the transgression of our first parents, condemned to the eternal torments of hell-fire. It must be confessed that the doctrine of the Church of England makes too near approaches to this opinion, when it tells us that, 'in every person born into the world, original sin deserves God's wrath and damnation,' — for the words seem to be too strong and express, to admit of those mollifying constructions which some, by way of apology, have thought proper to put upon them."*

While it would be the most hopeless of all tasks for a Calvinist to attempt to set aside the assertions quoted from "leading Calvinists," beginning with Calvin himself, in proof that the damnation of some infants has been expressly taught by them, it would be equally vain for such an advocate to dispute the logical inference of the doctrine from the Calvinistic system. How can the doctrine be kept out, as a consequence of that view of the nature and the state of man which we have been examining as a matter of controversy?

We must now attempt to state, in terms as brief and plain as is possible, the doctrinal position which Unitarianism has taken in rejecting this Calvinistic dogma of the ruin of the human race by the sin of the first man, and the consequent entail upon every human being of a depraved nature, the burden of which is guilt, the fruit of which is sin, and the doom of which is eternal woe. It can hardly be said that Unitarianism has fashioned any dogma of its own upon this point. Like all other classes of Christians, like all other serious thinkers, we are baffled by the original moral mystery involved in the existence or allowance of evil in the universe of God. The solution of that mystery would be an essential condition of any full and complete doctrinal formula as to the source of sin in man's heart and life, and before that mystery we bow in a bewildered amazement, and with an oppressed spirit which cannot look for relief in this stage and scene of our being. The great and leading position which Unitarianism takes in antagonism with the Calvinistic doctrine on this point is, that there must be some other construction put upon the facts and the

* Body of Divinity, 1760, pp. 292, 293.

arguments which are the materials for a theory, a construction radically opposed to that which Orthodoxy gives them. Unitarianism lives upon the conviction, that earth or heaven must afford some other explanation of our frailty and sinfulness than the assertion that the fruits of one man's disobedience are entailed upon all his posterity. Unitarianism lives upon the assurance that there must be some other mode of representing the essential terms of the Divine government over us, than by including among them this of the propagation through ordinary physical generation of a corrupted moral nature, the possession and the exercise of which makes us guilty before God. If God be the righteous legislator and judge of every human soul, he cannot hold us amenable to a higher standard than our natures will admit, nor visit upon us a sentence for another's sin, nor extend our responsibility beyond the range of our individual ability. By no effort of reasoning, and by no humbling restraint placed upon our impulse to reason, — by no straining of the mind to reach after truth above its grasp, and by no violent crushing down of our rebellious remonstrances, — can we reconcile the Calvinistic doctrine with our instinctive or our educated conceptions of God, the Wise, the Omnipotent, the Righteous. If this mortal life of ours puts us on trial for an eternity of conscious existence, no retributive results there can have in them the first element of justice, unless we have had an unprejudiced start here. Any disability of nature, any taint or bias or proclivity which precedes the conscious exercise of our powers, becomes an infinite injustice to us when its consequences are projected into a future state.

Yet Unitarianism recognizes the deep and the unsounded perplexities of this subject. No serious person can ever think or speak otherwise than with a profound and oppressive solemnity and dread about sin, the perversion and debasement of moral powers, the source of unmeasured woe, the defying attitude of human beings toward God. It is a relief to us to know that even the Orthodox theory of it is compelled to recognize for sin an origin or agency apart from the sphere of humanity, in attributing the instigation of it to a spirit of evil. Still Orthodoxy leaves wholly unexplained the alleged fact, that the Good Spirit subjected the first pair, on whose

conduct the fate of uncounted millions of intelligent beings was staked, to the machinations of that evil spirit. Unitarianism admits all the perplexing mysteries of fact and experience about sin, but does not feel disposed to deepen or increase them by involving them with satanic agencies, or with dates or incidents prior to or outside of human life on this globe. Unitarianism does not deny the sinfulness of man, nor does it discharge that sinfulness of positive guilt, nor does it trifle with the consequences of sin here or hereafter. Some of the most appalling admissions, and some of the most startling assertions as to the guilt and the devastations of sin, are to be found in the writings of Unitarians. We think our general views of it are all the more serious, because we ascribe it to character, not to nature, and regard it as a wilful wrong-doing, not as an inherited disease. Unitarians ask the Orthodox to help them, and they offer their aid to the Orthodox, that together we may try to cast some rays of reason, light, and truth upon this mystery of sin. But Unitarians insist, firmly and positively, without yielding on this point a hair's breadth, that the explanation proposed shall not involve the dogma that we are born with a depraved heart, that life is a foregone conclusion when it begins, that the nature which is God's endowment of us is corrupt, and that the character which is the development of that nature and the element of our accountability is from the first committed to a diseased and wicked growth. Calvin tells us (Comment. on Ephesians ii. 3): "We are not born such beings as Adam was created in the beginning, but are the corrupt descendants of a degenerate and adulterate parent." Dr. Woods, even in a note designed to relieve this dreary doctrine (Letter XI.), says: "There is nothing which hinders man from obedience but his depraved disposition, his wicked heart." What a dismal way of intimating that an impossibility might be a possibility, if it were not an impossibility! Suppose Dr. Woods, travelling with a companion on a dreary wilderness way, and coming to a well which he knew to be poisoned, should say: "There is nothing to hinder our being saved from a terrific death, and helped on to our happy homes, by the waters of this well, *except* that they are mixed with a deadly poison." His companion, if not an Orthodox casuist, would be apt

to reply, that the exception was fatal to any desired good from the waters. It is but little to say of the Calvinistic doctrine, that it relieves us of all responsibility. It substitutes a Pharaoh for our God, ever demanding his tale of brick while he withholds the material of them. Unitarians, therefore, insist that as to that weakness or liability in human nature which shows itself as we grow up as sinfulness, some other explanation of its origin shall be found than to call it an entailed curse, and some other reason shall be assigned for its existence in us than the sin of a progenitor, and some other title be given to it than guilt, and some other retribution be announced for our helpless disability than that of a hopeless hell.

Unitarians have been seeking, and are still seeking, for relief and for such satisfaction as may be within the reach of human faculties, concerning the problem of evil. They have received some most valuable aid in their speculations from Orthodox writers, who have worked, to some extent, with us and for us, while appearing to work against us. All the modifications, abatements, and palliatives of which professedly Orthodox writers have felt compelled to avail themselves in dealing with this doctrine, have been of great service to us. In the mean while Unitarianism, taking Scripture for its guide, develops its own peculiar views somewhat after the manner following. After God had fashioned and furnished this earth, he left it for long ages without a human inhabitant, while vegetables and animals lived and died upon it. The remains of these primeval plants and creatures, imbedded in some of the lower strata of the earth, bear witness for themselves. In his own good time, God was pleased to create a race of human beings to inhabit this earth in a series of generations. Some of the conditions and limitations to which the life and the range of existence of these beings would necessarily be subjected, were fixed in the elementary constitution and arrangements of the scene of their abode. They are human beings, a race lower than the angels. They are spirits in bodies of clay, formed from the dust of the earth, breathed into by the breath of God. By the universal law of all elemental organizations, human bodies need renewal, are exposed to disease and accident, and subject to waste, decay, and death. These human

beings are moral beings. So far as they are accountable beings they are free, and so far as they are free beings they are accountable. That they may be free to do right, they must also be free to do wrong. Adam, the representative man, was capable of sinning, and as the extremest Calvinist never pretended that Adam was created with a depraved nature, the conclusion is irresistible that a human being may be capable of sinning, and may actually sin, without having any original taint of corruption or depravity. This inevitable inference visits an utter discomfiture on the Calvinistic dogma, that *our* sin can have no other origin or source than a vitiated nature. If Adam could commit actual sin, though he was not born in original sin, so may each one of his posterity err as he did without inheriting iniquity from him. The only idea which we can form of the purpose for which human beings exist, is that they may serve the ends of their Creator by the best use of the faculties he has given them. In connection with all the physical powers and relations of these beings, relations which concern the body and its wants, we think we discern an inner life, a nobler range of existence, in the elements of thought, of affection, of conscience, a life of the mind and the spirit, amid cares and conflicts, failures and attainments, lapses and recoveries. That this higher life may be served, good and evil must be placed before these human beings, while the command is addressed to them to "overcome evil with good." However far we may carry the assertion or the allowance of an unexceptionable and a universal human sinfulness, we must stop short of the admission that man is necessarily a sinner, for this admission at once severs the connection between sin and responsibility. This necessary sinfulness is admitted, if it be affirmed that man has a corrupted nature. An evil tree can bring forth only evil fruit. The decision as regards our moral character cannot be supposed to have been made at our birth, but the means, the materials for making it, must lie latent in the germ of humanity, and life will afford the opportunity and the scene of their development. We are not born holy, for then we should be what the angels now are, who are denizens of heaven while we are creatures of the earth. We are not born fiends, for we are made after the similitude of God.

As these beings must be capable of doing wrong in order that they may be able to do right, they should not be restrained physically or morally from feeling impulses to do wrong. They should be addressed by the power of outward temptations, and there should be internal weaknesses, spots on their breasts not defended by heavenly mail, — spots and weaknesses which temptation should assail. Righteousness, holiness, conformity to the will of God, is the highest possible result which we could look for to be attained by such beings, and we should never dream of realizing it as a birthright, nor as an instinct, nor as secured by an inward impulse, nor by outward help. It should be the result of life-long struggles and strivings, of falling and of rising often, of groanings and weepings, of aching and praying, of sinning and repenting. It is enough for man if he can die a reconciled penitent. It is enough for him if he can reach at the end of his course, after a life of blind and troubled wanderings, that same Father's house from which he went out as an infant and an embryo spirit.

Should any one object that it is not worthy of God to be charged with the creation of such a race of beings, we reply, that this is just the race of beings that inhabits this earth, and that the fact speaks for itself. Here they are, and they have never been anything different from what they are. At any rate, the sort of beings which we have aimed to portray from the reality of life are, in our judgment, infinitely more worthy of God than are those which Calvinism ascribes to him. Imperfect then we are; imperfect, frail, and mortal. Adam proved in his own case the result of the experiment made by God with the elements and conditions involved in the constitution of a human being. The result of the experiment in one case of course signified what would be its result in all cases. As Adam was a sinner and a mortal, so all human beings are sinners and all are mortal; *not because he was a sinner, but because they are all like him in their humanity.* But is this nature of ours *corrupt and depraved* because it is *imperfect*? Does the fact that we must all learn righteousness prove that we have previously graduated in iniquity? Does our imperfection prove that we are cursed, and does our being under that curse prove our guilt? Let us see.

There are four elements needed, as we say, to make up a human being, — a body, a heart, a mind, and a spirit. These are all undeveloped, untrained at our birth. How do we regard the infirmities, the imperfections, the need of discipline, help, and reinforcement to which they are respectively subject?

If a child is born with an inherited bodily defect, crippled, deformed, maimed, or blind, he is an object of our tender commiseration. Who ever blames him for his defect? Who would address to him a word of reproof, or inflict upon him a blow, as for sin? Even if his defect is entailed upon him for the sin of his parents, this is not his personal guilt, and though it subjects him to suffering, his suffering is not punishment. His visitation is directly from the hand of God.

If a child is born with a feeble intellectual faculty, and it is very hard to teach him, and teaching utterly fails through his dulness of mind, still there is no guilt in this, but simply an original natural deficiency.

If a child is lacking in affectionate sensibilities of heart, and shows from infancy an ungovernable temper, the parents will try patient culture to subdue and train the child's heart, and up to its mature years its faults are for the most part spoken of as constitutional infirmities, rarely as guilt, while its moderate success in self-restraint is estimated as a heroism in self-discipline.

Thus it is that we disconnect all natural defects of body, mind, and heart from the imputation of guilt. We do not expect a child to walk till it has *learned* to walk; nor to read till it has *learned* to read. We are satisfied always if a child learns anything after it has been taught, and the more valuable the art or science or knowledge which is communicated, the more content are we to multiply efforts, to extend patience, and to prolong time in imparting it, and in looking for the fruits of the instruction. But now mark the inconsistency of Orthodoxy as it deals with the fourth element in a human being, — the spirit. While the whole of life is allowed to be education and preparation in the training and use of all our lower faculties, the very dawn of life is expected to show a full-formed perfection in the exercise and manifestation of our highest faculty. Orthodoxy tolerates infants that cannot walk, or read, or love their

parents beyond others; but it will not tolerate an infant that does not love and obey God in perfect holiness of spirit. If the spirit of this little helpless being does not instinctively discern and follow the supreme good, and without any struggle, training, or conflict, any guidance or experience, yield itself to the love of piety, then Orthodoxy cries out, A *Fall*, a *Corruption*, an *Alienation* from God! Over the waste of dreary ages, and through the ashes of mortal generations, Orthodoxy tries to trace back the venom in that infant's constitution to the slime which the old serpent dropped from its mouth when it spake its deceiving word to Eve.

Dr. Woods puts to Dr. Ware this question: "Do children show a heart to love God supremely, when they are two or three years old?"* We may answer the question by asking another: Why should they? When it takes the highest spiritual exercises of an eminent saint to fashion forth an adequate conception of God, how can we expect a child two or three years old to love that God supremely?

It seems to us as if Orthodoxy involved not only the notion that Adam, not God, is the father of all human spirits, but likewise the implication that God has nothing to do in his usual providence with the training of any human spirits except those of the elect. Does not Orthodoxy convey the implication, that when human spirits are launched upon this earth, God, as a usual thing, has done with them? Now we regard the beings we have described from the realities of life as constantly dependent on the Divine guardianship and grace; as constantly needing new replenishments of spiritual power and aid; and as constantly receiving, or at liberty to avail themselves of, such help in their earthly training. We do not believe that we are all orphaned of heavenly affection and care the day after we are born, left as infants in a wilderness cast to the wolves. It is not our doctrine, that the influences of God's Spirit are granted to some and withheld from others. We believe that his Spirit is ever prompting and helping all spirits, and is rejected when not yielded to and accepted; that aid of the Spirit is not a specialty even, still less a partiality, any

* Reply, Chap. II.

more than is a parent's needful advice and oversight in the training of all his children; that spiritual influence is the needful and the natural complement to the elements of our nature, and to the other influences which develop it.

We should need space exceeding that which we have already occupied, if we attempted to do anything like justice in stating the various modifications which have been introduced during the last century into the old Calvinistic doctrine of the corrupted and disabled nature and the doomed state of man. These modifications are designed to relieve and soften the doctrine, to make it less revolting, and, if possible, more reasonable. It is to be understood that these palliating devices are invented by men who still profess to hold substantially the doctrine of the Catechism and the Confession, and who claim a right to avail themselves of the utmost liberty of explanation and abatement. When we contemplate as a whole the subtleties, the worse than dubious ingenuities, and the self-convicted duplicity in evasion, which have been spent upon this Calvinistic doctrine by some of its nominal disciples, a rising disgust for everything associated with this department of our theological literature nearly overwhelms us. There is but one suggestion that relieves our feelings; it is, that all these efforts are made out of a tender desire to reconcile the God of the creed with the God of the heart. It is not strange, however, that Unitarians should watch with a very lively interest, and occasionally with a sort of subdued and mischievous satisfaction, the processes and the results of these modifications of Calvinism. The disciples of that system must have become fully aware that it is a venturous and a hazardous work to attempt to bring its dogmas into reconciliation with right reason.

There are three elements entering into the doctrine of the entail from Adam upon all his posterity of a disabled nature, and they suggest three questions: First, is this disability of nature a fact? Second, is it to be regarded as constituting, in the eye of God, personal guilt? Third, does it involve an everlasting and inexpressible penalty? Of course a very large range is opened for pleading and for modifying opinions in the discussion of these three elements of the old doctrine. Doctor Chauncy, who

held the Calvinistic views in the most moderate form, if he held them at all, took refuge in Universalism, as did the late amiable and earnest John Foster, of whose orthodoxy there is no question.

Down almost to the time of the commencement of our great controversy, the general teaching of Orthodoxy conformed to the doctrine of the Confession, that a corrupted nature, a vitiated and depraved constitution, was transmitted from Adam to all his posterity, by natural descent, exactly as a bodily disease, a gout or a consumption, would be transmitted. This certainly implies a physical inheritance of depravity, a depravity running in the blood; and this legitimate inference from the doctrine was universally drawn from it, and universally accepted. It was at this point that the shock of the doctrine was first and most strongly felt, and here an issue had been opened between Orthodox theologians before Unitarians were a recognized party in the case. Dr. Lyman Beecher has given us a very concise summary of the matter in hand, in substance as follows.* He reminds us that Pelagius maintained that infants were born pure, and became depraved by a corrupted moral atmosphere and by bad example, while he denied that there is any certain connection between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity. Augustine, on the other hand, asserted an innate, hereditary depravity, by the imputation of Adam's sin. Dr. Beecher adds, that the Reformers agreed with Augustine in the belief that sin was propagated with flesh and blood. Certainly one would think that, after this admission, it was no Unitarian slander to charge this doctrine upon those whose boast it was that they held to "the doctrines of the Reformation." This doctrine was first openly assailed after the Reformation, says Dr. Beecher, by the Arminians and the Remonstrants, and was one of the Five Points under sharp debate in the Synod of Dort. The Pelagian doctrine, having been revived at the Synod, has found acceptance and prevalence in the Established Church of England, while "our fathers," down to the time of Edwards, and including him, held close to the views of the Reformers. After the time of Edwards, Dr.

* *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Vol. I. p. 158.

Beecher proceeds to tell us, the way of stating the doctrine was changed. "Now, the New or Hopkinsian divinity holds that men are not guilty of Adam's sin, and that depravity is not of the substance of the soul, nor an inherent or physical quality, but is wholly voluntary, and consists in the transgression of law, in such circumstances as constitutes accountability and desert of punishment." Our readers will observe that, while the old doctrine has a meaning perfectly lucid, which explains itself to us at a glance, the modifications of it are for the most part stated in a cloudy, obscure, unintelligible way, as if their vagueness and indefiniteness of terms would afford a sensible relief. Dr. Beecher, if hard pressed in close conversation by a clear-headed questioner, would have to admit that "the transgression of law," and the "circumstances," of which he speaks, involve the original elements of the nature which an infant receives from the Creator on being born into this world.

In the first number of the periodical just quoted, we find the Orthodox belief on this doctrine stated thus: "That since the Fall of Adam, men are, in their natural state, altogether destitute of true holiness, and entirely depraved. That men, though thus depraved, are justly required to love God with all the heart, and justly punishable for disobedience; or, in other words, they are complete moral agents, proper subjects of moral government, and truly accountable to God for their actions."* One year passed, and then the same periodical announced the following: "We do not believe that the posterity of Adam are personally chargeable with eating the forbidden fruit [that is, they did not bite the same apple]; or that their constitution is so depraved as to leave them no natural ability to love and serve God, or as to render it improper for him to require obedience."† Again is the scale of modifications a scale of unintelligibilities. How plain, as well as strong in contrast, is the language of President Edwards, when he tells us: "All natural men's affections are governed by malice against God, and they hate him worse than they do the Devil." Considering that these natural affections have their source in the heart, and that the heart is the endowment which

* *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Vol. I. p. 11.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. II. p. 4.

we receive from God, the inference from the assertion is unavoidable, unless we again have recourse to the notion that Adam, and not God, is our Creator.

Yet, strange to say, there has been a dispute among the Orthodox as to whether Edwards did or did not teach the doctrine of the physical entail of depravity! Strange to say, he has been claimed as an authority, both by those who believe the old doctrine in this form, and by those who deny it. Any unprofessional reader who should attempt to peruse the discussion of this question, Did Edwards, or did he not, teach that human nature was constitutionally depraved by physical entail? would be apt to give over the task with a rather hopeless idea of the lucidness of some doctors of divinity.

The Orthodox Congregationalists around us have agreed upon some terms of amity touching their differences of Old School and New School, as to the matter of Original Sin, and the essential quality of our depravity. But the Presbyterians, who build upon the Westminster Catechism, and mean to stand or to fall with that, are by no means inclined to pacification on this issue. There has been a fierce strife carried on under the blinding cloud of dust raised by the fraternal quarrel of the Old and the New Schools, as to whether man's *Inability* to meet the requirements of God's law is a *Natural Inability*, or a *Moral Inability*. The Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely, in his "Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism," (published in 1811,) has given us a sharp rehearsal of the controversy, as between the real Orthodoxy of our Middle States and the diluted Orthodoxy of New England. But to us this question between the two Schools is not even a war of words; for the word *Inability*, the only emphatic and decisive word involved in their doctrine, is a word accepted and used on both sides. All in vain does Dr. Woods tell us that *Moral Inability*, in which he believes, means only "a strong disinclination" to do the will of God, and that "it constitutes blameworthiness," — "while *Natural Inability*," in which he does not believe, "*frees from blameworthiness.*"* For he also tells us, in his Fifth Letter to us, "that men are subjects of an innate moral depravity, in other words,

* Works, Vol. IV. p. 285.

that they are from the first inclined to evil." *From the first!*—the whole doctrine goes with those words. The force, the stress, the strain of the doctrine, lies in the word *Inability*,—that noun substantive which tells the effect of a death-blow struck at the very core of our being. It makes very little difference whether we connect with that substantive the epithet *Natural* or *Moral*, for the adjective seems in this instance almost to lose the office assigned to it in the grammar, of *qualifying* a noun. Yet the two epithets make two schools. How significant is the token that a hair's breadth of relief, or of supposed relief, by vagueness of words, under the old doctrine, is welcomed as a blessing. One School tells us man's depravity consists in this: "He *cannot* do right if he wishes to do so." "No," says the other School; "it consists in this: He *will not* do right if he can." *He can't if he will!*—*He won't if he can!* A precious difference! It is well for the two Schools that they have both retained the word *Inability*. Their Orthodoxy is safe so long as they hold to that, but their *loyalty* to Orthodoxy is doubtful if they are bent on neutralizing the substantive by any adjective. There certainly is a real difference between a lack of *power*, and a lack of the *will* to do one's duty; but if the lack of *will* springs from a lack of *power to will*, or of a capacity of being influenced by the will otherwise than to disobedience, a moral want of will becomes essentially a natural want of power.

Then there is what may be called "the Privative Theory" of our depravity. Some Orthodox men have found an appreciable degree of comfort in this theory. It suggests, that, besides having all the faculties and opportunities which we have for meeting our responsibility to God, Adam was favored with a peculiar spiritual guardianship, an additional inducement and protection from a closer intercourse with the grace of God, which additional security has been withdrawn from all his posterity, leaving them, under the *privation* of divine grace, to the common influences and circumstances of our appointed state of being. Well may we ask: If Adam, with such an additional security, could not retain his innocence, is our condition fairly allotted to us, when it visits upon us the inheritance of his depravity, and *deprives* us of his original aid from the Divine Father?

Still another modification of the old doctrine is proposed in the theory, that we are not at our birth positively and actually sinful, but are simply *destitute of holiness*. An infant is destitute of holiness! Very true. So he is. And so he is destitute of arithmetic and spelling. But this does not prove that he is ruined, nor that he will go to the pit. It certainly does not prove that he deserves to go to the pit, for a natural lack of the knowledge or the attainments for the purpose of acquiring which he is brought into this world as a school. As well might we complain of an oak for not bearing full-grown trees instead of little acorns.

The most recent and every way the most astonishing device that has been suggested by one professing to hold the old Orthodox doctrine, for the sake of abating its manifest inconsistency with the righteous method of government established by God, is that proposed by Dr. Edward Beecher, in his marvellously significant book entitled "*The Conflict of Ages*." He admits, he asserts, he strenuously and emphatically protests against, the conflicting relation which Orthodoxy presents to us between what God requires of us and the nature and opportunity which we have for meeting his demands. God calls us into being with a depraved nature, exposes us to the corrupting influences of a fallen world, and subjects us to the assaults of evil spirits, and then holds over us a law of holiness which we are incapacitated from obeying, while any falling short of it condemns us to an unending woe. No Unitarian pen has ever made a more painful or a more appalling statement of the irreconcilable conflict between Orthodox doctrine and the laws of honor and justice ascribed to the Divine government, than the pen of Dr. Beecher has written out with a most heroic sturdiness of candor. His conclusion is, that, according to the Orthodox doctrine, God has not dealt fairly with us, but is practising toward us a tyranny of the most ruthless sort. God has not given us a fair start, an unprejudiced, free, and hopeful trial for an immortal issue. If God has appointed our earthly existence as a probation for eternal life, he should have created us with an integrity of nature and a healthfulness of soul which would have excluded every sinful proclivity or bias; indeed, we might even claim that we should have been

biased in the direction of holiness. Orthodoxy says we are not born in this state of innocence. Dr. Beecher says the same, and he says it with an unquestioned loyalty to the creed in conformity with which he discharges his office of a Christian minister. How then does he reconcile the "Conflict" which he has so nobly and so faithfully delineated? Why thus. He says that we *once* had a fair and unprejudiced start in the unending career of existence; — not indeed here, in this world, but elsewhere. We were not *created* when we were born into this world. We had been created and had existed in another place, and in another state, as spirits, and had sinned, and fallen, and been condemned. God is giving us here a new trial under the light of the Gospel. Reserved in some of the gloomy caverns of sentenced guilt and hopeless despair in this universe, are imprisoned the rebel crew of angels who sided with Satan in the great rebellion in heaven. When an infant body is born into this world, God looses from the chains of that prison-house one of these condemned spirits, with the chance of being numbered among the elect as one whom the Gospel of Christ may redeem. Behold how wonderfully this solution of the problem converts the darkest imputation ever cast upon the righteous government of God into a most winning display of his grace, in offering a new opportunity to beings already condemned! Calvinism requires of beings created as sinners that they should live as angels. Dr. Beecher sees the countenance of an old fiend under the sweet features of infancy, and takes the fair mask as the symbol of a redemption which, by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, shall recall that victim of the pit to the communion of the saints above. Such is the latest modification of Calvinism.

We have thus given — at a tedious, though a necessary length — a statement of the controversy opened fifty years ago, and ever since kept open, between Unitarianism and Orthodoxy, on the Scripture doctrine of the Nature and the State of Man. We have stated the Calvinistic doctrine in the words of the old formula, which is even to this day nominally held in Orthodox churches and schools of theology. We have avowed the positive denial of that doctrine, and of every accepted modification of it, by Unitarianism, and have presented the general

views which Unitarians in the lack of a dogma adopt as a substitute for that doctrine. There is a vast difference between falling *from* and falling *short of* holiness. We deny that there has ever been on this earth a *fall* of a single human being *from holiness*, and assert the fact that all human beings *fall short of holiness*. Finally, we have made a brief reference to some of the modifying and qualifying theories which Orthodox writers have invented to relieve the strain of their own doctrine.

And now comes a question which embraces two terms, as it concerns the present bearings and aspect of this controversy to the original parties to it: Is Unitarianism yielding its opinion, reconciling its difference, abating its opposition, and going over to Orthodoxy, on the ground covered by this doctrine? We answer positively, No! Unitarianism does not yield an inch. It holds its ground firmly and resolutely, and means to hold it. It was never better assured of its position than now.

Is Orthodoxy yielding its ground on this doctrine? Our readers shall answer that question for themselves.

In the mean while, how shall the two parties to an old strife regard their present relations to each other, in view of their fundamental variance concerning this one doctrine involved in the dark mystery of sin? Let us cease from all acrimony and strife, and try together to throw what light we can upon the problem. A truer philosophy of life and of man may help us. A better understanding of the Scriptures may aid us. But after all, Unitarians and Orthodox will be most likely to throw light on this sad mystery of sin, when with Christian hearts and hands they strive faithfully, in their own way, to rid themselves and the world of its malignant power.

G. E. E.

ART. IV. — POETRY.

CHRIST IN THE FLESH.

In every life Christ comes again to earth,
Takes on him our humanity once more,
Renews the heavenly in the earthly birth,
And bears again the cross that once he bore.

Cradled in palace, or in manger laid,
Christ in the infant's innocence appears ;
God's morning star lighting e'en sin's dark shade,
Earth's weeping way, its conflicts and its tears.

In every soul by deep compassion moved,
Christ walks again among the humble poor ;
And in the "fleshy robe" shall still be loved,
While human woe and sympathy endure.

Christ's voice is heard in every kindly tone,
That seeks t' ennoble man, or comfort grief ;
And he is seen where Mercy strives alone
(Though weak and poor) to minister relief.

Christ bids the Tempter *now* behind him get,
Where firm Integrity unwavering stands,
And unfair schemes of gain with scorn are met,
And the Soul flingeth back sin's base demands !

O, not upon the dim cathedral's wall
Hangeth the Christ, whom we may love, adore ;
Nor may his pictured woe alone recall
The deep, deep agony for man he bore !

Christ knocketh now at every human heart,
As at the sisters' door in Bethany ;
Like Martha, we neglect the better part,
Turn from our Guest to earthly cares away.

L. L. A. V.

THE DISCOVERY.

LIKE one who wanders sad and solitary,
In lonesome woods, unguided and astray,
The sport of hopes that every moment vary,
And bird-like voices calling every way,
And comes at last upon a little clearing, —
A sweet thought in the heart of solitude, —
And hails with joy the beautiful appearing
Of azure sky and sun above the wood ;—

Like such a one I roved, in manhood's morning,
Perplexed and lost, not knowing where to turn ;
The voice of hope was saddened into warning,
Nor any certain path could eye discern.
At length a thought was born within my bosom,
A ray of light fell on me from afar,
And straight the folded bud began to blossom,
The nebula to round into a star.

And now before me shines, in white and crimson,
The flower of life that was a bud so long ;
The sun, the king of stars, the sky he swims on,
And all great things, are bursting into song :
“ O happy rover, that hast found thy duty !
O happy soul ! if thou hast come to see
The perfect law of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty,
Nature's one secret, — not to do, but *be* ! ”

E. J. C.

ART. V. — BROOKS'S HISTORY OF MEDFORD.*

It was the great object of the Massachusetts Historical Society, in its early institution, to collect and preserve materials for American history, and more particularly the history of our own Commonwealth. In pursuance of this object, the Society encouraged the preparation of sketches of towns, and readily assigned them a place in its printed collections. The early efforts were humble; a few pages sufficed for the history of a town, because the subject was not valued to any extent by the general mind; indeed, a taste for the requisite investigations was to be created. Even our educated men, as a class, were incurious touching the annals of our own country, and its local municipalities, — perhaps rather commending themselves for their neglect, — while they would have been ashamed to be counted ignorant of the history of ancient and modern Europe. Hence meagre narrative satisfied the limited demand, and the town chronicler was generally looked upon with compassion, — if perchance he escaped contempt, — as a very harmless and useless being.

But now all this is changed; with the general growth with the growth of our towns, the importance of preserving in memory the substantial elements of their early condition and subsequent progress, which, in the aggregate, make up the grand characteristics of our people, is become well understood. Thus we have seen in recent times elaborate local histories, worthy of their English types, and more worthy than they, as leading to greater results. And the cry is, Still they come; and they will continue to come, a swelling host, until scarcely a town in New England will be without its historian. Shattuck's Concord, Deane's Scituate, Lincoln's Worcester, Felt's Salem and Ipswich, William Barry's Framingham, J. S. Barry's Hanover, and other commendable works, have led the way, and now, marching with them in the van, we have a goodly volume, the history of the ancient, respectable, and pleasant town of

* *History of the Town of Medford, Middlesex County, Massachusetts, from its First Settlement in 1630, to the Present Time, 1855.* By CHARLES BROOKS. Boston: Published by James M. Usher. 1855. pp. 576.

Medford, given to the public by the Rev. Charles Brooks, a worthy native of that town, from materials gathered on every side with the painstaking industry to which all must submit who *aspire* to produce a good work of this class. He comes to his task with well-disciplined forces, with the loving interest of one to the manor born, and well charged with praiseworthy antiquarian zeal.

There are two ways of weaving town histories, — the one by arranging a mere tissue of facts and dates, the other by incorporating in the fabric whatever else may give life and beauty, as well as truth and strength, producing the harmonious character and coloring of well-reasoned, elaborate works. Mr. Brooks has wisely chosen the latter course, and for reasons which he well states in his Preface. He would not, nor would we, willingly permit these comparatively humble narratives to be held in little regard; for they contain all the germs of general history in the civil and social condition of the people.

Medford is one of our oldest towns in its municipal organization. Its beginnings, however, were more feeble than those of the other contemporaneous plantations, — and this not because it was settled by *mean men*, — to use Governor Winthrop's expression in another instance, but because its territory was very small, and out of this small territory the Court had carved out numerous acres as a grant to Cradock, a non-resident proprietor, contrary to the early, well-settled, and wise policy of New England. Hence the growth in population and general productive industry was so slow, that there was no settled minister in the town until after the Province Charter of 1691.

The worthy Governor Cradock, who devoted so much time, and expended so much of his estate, in promoting the settlement of the Bay, never visited the Colony, though he continued his interest in its behalf, and sent over his agent and a large number of servants to occupy his grant and engage in ship-building, a branch of business that has ever since been a large source of the prosperity and wealth of Medford.

There is an old building still standing, called the "Fort" and the "Garrison House," which Mr. Brooks gives good reasons for believing was built by Cradock in

1634, and designed for his residence should he visit the plantation. We may venture to affirm that there was no planter in the hamlet of Medford, at that time, competent in estate to erect a dwelling-house of this size. Log-houses with thatched roofs sufficed for their shelter and satisfied their wants while engaged in clearing their lands and bringing them into cultivation.

The Cradock House, says the author, "is on land slightly elevated, where no higher land or rocks could be used by enemies to assail it, and is so near the river as to allow of reinforcements from Boston. Its walls are eighteen inches thick. There were heavy iron bars across the two large arched windows, which are near the ground, in the back of the house; and there are several fire-proof closets within the building. The house stood in an open field for a century and a half, and could be approached only by a private road through gates. As the outside door was cased with iron, it is certain that it was intended to be fire-proof. There was one pane of glass, set in iron, placed in the back wall of the western chimney, so as to afford a sight of persons coming from the town.

"It was probably built for retreat and defence; but some of the reasons for calling it a fort are not conclusive. Outside shutters were in common use in England at the time above mentioned; and so was it common to ornament houses with round or oval openings on each side of the front. These ovals are twenty inches by sixteen. . . . The bricks are not English bricks, either in size, color, or workmanship. They are from eight to eight and a half inches long, from four to four and a quarter inches wide, and from two and a quarter to two and three quarters thick. They have the color of the bricks made afterwards in East Medford. . . . There is a tradition, that in early times Indians were discovered lurking around it for several days and nights, and that a skirmish took place between them and the white men; but we have not been able to verify the facts or fix the date. The park impaled by Mr. Cradock probably included this house. It is undoubtedly one of the oldest buildings in the United States; perhaps *the oldest that retains its first form*. It has always been in use, and, by some of its tenants, has not been honored for its age. Its walls are yet strong, and we hope it may be allowed to stand for a century to come. We wish some rich antiquarian would purchase it, restore to it its ancient appendages, and make it a depository for Medford antiquities, for an historical library, and a museum of natural curiosities." — pp. 46, 47.

At Cradock's expense chiefly the bridge was built

which spans the river running between the villages on either side, and was the first toll-bridge in the country, and of large benefit in causing the town to be the great thoroughfare of travel to and from the East. The inhabitants felt the benefit, and magnified it so much that even more than a century afterwards, when it was proposed to build a bridge at Penny Ferry,—the present Malden Bridge,—the whole sovereignty of Medford became violently excited, and resisted the project to the utmost. The old cry of impending destruction was raised, and the people refused to be comforted. This was in the day of Rev. Dr. Osgood, who entered with all his zeal—and that was no trifling element in his composition—into the feelings and apprehensions of his people. He wrote a long, indignant, and characteristic letter upon the subject, in which he expresses his fears for “the destruction of Medford,” and is severe, even up to *his* full measure of severity, upon the worthy Judge Russell of Charlestown, the projector of Charles River Bridge.*

The inhabitants always remained at peace with the remnants of the Indian tribes in their neighborhood, though at times, and probably owing to their own feeble and sparse population, they were so far apprehensive of hostility as to erect fortified houses,—two of which are still standing, one of them, before referred to, supposed to have been built by Cradock.

The principal divisions of the book are into civil, political, military, and ecclesiastical history. All these enter into the fundamental constitution of Massachusetts towns, and make them in truth so many little republics, with large and well-defined duties, so that out of them, and generated by them, more than from all else, have grown up the education, intelligence, and true social equality which are distinguishing characteristics in our Commonwealth. History affords no such precise examples. There was no power so minute, none so wide and extended in church or state, that did not enter either directly or indirectly into the constitution, and come under the cognizance, of these municipal corporations.

* Pages 70, 71.

Though Medford was of slow growth in its earlier period, its growth was healthy, and it has always been a quiet, well-ordered town. Its population, like that of the other Massachusetts settlements, was homogeneous from the beginning until within a few years; and having a Puritan basis and increase, it of course possessed all the elements of material, intellectual, and religious prosperity. All this Mr. Brooks has well and briefly described; and has further delineated in the lives of Governor Brooks, Dr. Tufts, and many others in civil life, and in an extended notice of the worthy and useful citizen, Colonel Royall, who, however brave he may have been, answering to his military title, proved very timid at the beginning of the Revolution, and, after halting for a while between two opinions, finally abandoned the country that he might have peace in the decline of life. Far from being an out and out Tory, he was kindly affected towards his country, and proved himself a friend to our institutions, even *flagrante bello*, by establishing a professor's chair at Cambridge, which has been worthily filled by a succession of distinguished jurists.

The political history of Medford possesses but little of moment until we approach the period of the Revolution. At this time a strong interest gathers around it, and a unanimity of patriotic sentiment pervades it, not exceeded by that of any other town in the Province. The Resolves were brave in expression, and, what is better, were fearlessly carried out in action. Colonel Royall seems to have been the only one of *mixed* sentiments, — the result in his case of position, association, and other circumstances, combined with an unwarlike temperament.

The military department exhibits a clean and bright record. Training to arms was an early necessity forced upon the colonists by their peculiar condition in relation to the Indian tribes, and afterwards by apprehensions from the French, and so continuing on until the close of the Revolutionary contest. In the first period, while early and riper manhood was included in the train-bands, the Colony laws required that lads from ten to sixteen years of age should be instructed on the usual training-days, of which, by the way, there were eight in each year, "in the exercise of arms." Thus it was that prep-

aration was made in each generation for the final contest that should insure either entire independence, or humiliating subjugation. Medford furnished her full supply of men and means for the great struggle, and this she seems to have done with great promptness and unanimity. She furnished gallant officers, among whom we would name Captain Thomas Pritchard, Colonel Ebenezer Francis, fearless and intelligent officers, and John Brooks, successively Major, Colonel, and General, the friend of Washington, thoroughly tried as a soldier and patriot, from the day of the Lexington and Concord fight, through sundry well-fought battles during the war, — afterwards the excellent Governor of our good old Commonwealth for seven successive years, — who gave two beloved sons to the service of his country, in the war of 1812, and, whether in public or private life, exhibited all those traits of character which mark the gentleman, the patriot, and the Christian.

The author gives an instance of Pritchard's daring and presence of mind, which occurred in the fall of 1776, soon after Howe had taken possession of New York.

“One day he had been making explorations with his company, when he came unexpectedly among a large force of British cavalry in a road. The English commander cried out to him, ‘Well, Pritchard, we’ve got you at last.’ ‘Not exactly,’ replied Pritchard; and he immediately ordered his men to form across the road, and to prepare for a charge. The cavalry stopped. The wind was favorable to carry the smoke of Pritchard’s fire directly among the enemy. The English commander felt that there must be great loss to him if he should open a fire, owing to the narrow defile and the adverse wind. He therefore stood still. To retreat, and also to gain time, was Pritchard’s policy; and he accomplished it thus. He walked behind his men, and touched every other one in the whole line, and then ordered those that he had touched to retreat backwards twenty steps. They did so, and there halted. This position kept each of his men in a fit order to fire or to charge, as might be necessary. As soon as this half had halted, he ordered the remaining half to retreat slowly in the same way; to pass through the line, and retreat twenty steps behind the front rank. They did so successfully. The cavalry rushed forward, but did not fire. Pritchard’s men understood the movement, and were not terrified at superior numbers. They continued to retreat in this unassailable and American fashion for nearly an hour, when the narrow

road ended in a broken, rocky pasture. Now their destruction seemed certain. Captain Pritchard saw near him a ledge of rocks and a narrow pass. He resolved to get there if he could. But how could it be done? The enemy had now come out, and nearly surrounded him. He formed his men into a hollow square, and ordered them to retreat sideways towards that narrow pass. They did so, each keeping his place, and presenting his bayonet to the foe. They reached the rock; and there they must stop. With their backs to the precipice, and their face to the enemy, they must now surrender or die. They had resolved to try the chances of battle. The British had now come round them in such overwhelming numbers, that they felt desperate. Just as the British officer had ordered them to surrender, a detachment of American troops came suddenly upon them. The cavalry saw they themselves must be taken; and they turned and fled.

"Major Brooks narrated to General Washington every particular of this victorious stratagem; and Washington said, 'There is nothing in our military history yet that surpasses the ingenuity and fortitude of that manœuvre.'" — pp. 193, 194.

We will not say that this anecdote wears the appearance of romance, for the Revolution witnessed many marvellous exploits; but we are glad that it is vouched by Major Brooks, in commendation of one of his own townsmen.

Of Colonel Francis, a native of Medford, and after 1766 an inhabitant of Beverly, we are told that he

"was commissioned as Captain by the Continental Congress, July 1, 1775; next year rose to the rank of Colonel, and commanded a regiment on Dorchester Heights from August to December, 1776. Authorized by Congress, he raised the eleventh Massachusetts regiment, and, in January, 1777, marched at the head of it to Ticonderoga. Monday, July 7, 1777, a skirmish took place between the eleventh Massachusetts regiment and the British, at Hubbardton, near Whitehall, N. Y., in which Colonel Francis fell. A private journal of Captain Greenleaf, now in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society, says: 'Colonel Francis first received a ball through his right arm; but still continued at the head of his troops till he received the fatal wound through his body, entering his right breast. He dropped on his face.' His chaplain says: 'No officer so noticed for his military accomplishments and regular life as he. His conduct in the field is spoken of in the highest terms of applause.'" — p. 195.

"John Francis, a brother of the Colonel, born in Medford, Sept. 28, 1753, was Adjutant in the regiment commanded by

his brother, and fought bravely at Hubbardton. He was in several battles during the six years of his service, and at the capture of Burgoyne was wounded." — p. 196.

"Another gallant action by a Medford Sergeant, in the heat of the battle at White Plain, deserves a special record. Francis Tufts saw the standard-bearer fall: he flew to the spot, seized the standard, lifted it in the air, and rushed to the front rank of the line, and there marched forward, calling upon the men to follow. This was seen by General Washington. As soon as the victory was won, the General asked Colonel Brooks the name of the young man, in his regiment, who achieved that noble act. He was told; and there, on the stump of a tree, the General immediately wrote his commission of Adjutant." — p. 196.

Medford's ecclesiastical experiences resemble those of other New England towns, — less contentious, perhaps, in some respects, but giving out the usual indications, in strife touching the *locus in quo* of church buildings, and measurably as to doctrines, but finally settling down into a quiet condition until the rending of the Congregational denomination, — the result of the sharp controversy first systematically started within the present century.

The earliest settled minister, Rev. Aaron Porter, passed the time of his sojourning in Medford in great quiet, and was well and justly beloved by his people. He rested from his labors among them but with his life. The most important theological matter with which we are made acquainted concerning his ministry is the adoption by his church of the *half-way covenant*, — a covenant which was warmly resisted by many, both of the clergy and people, when originally proposed, and which many of the Orthodox clergy of the present day consider as the first great defection from the doctrine and practice of the early New England Church.

Then came the Rev. Ebenezer Turell, a more distinguished man, with a longer term of ministerial labor, inclined to the old order of the churches, and sternly opposing the burning zeal of Whitefield.

"He published, 1742, a pamphlet called 'A Direction to my People in Relation to the Present Times.' In this book, he calls on his people to distinguish between the fervors of their excited imaginations and the still, small voice of God's effectual grace; he also cautions them against believing in multitudinous meetings as the best places for true gospel learning and Christian piety; he furthermore suggests the expediency of not narrating their

religious experiences, for fear that spiritual pride will take the place of humility ; he openly blames those preachers who travel about, and, without being asked, go and act the bishop in other men's dioceses. In this pamphlet, Mr. Turell names 'thirteen particulars' ; or, in other words, objections to the 'new-light movement.' The censorious spirit ; the representing assurance to be the essence of saving faith, and that, without this assurance, none should come to the Lord's table ; the false witness of the Spirit ; the insecurity of dreams, spiritual visions, and impulses ; preaching without study ; esteeming unconverted ministers as useless ; the preaching and praying of women in public ; the want of decent order in public worship ; the over-estimate of sudden light and comfort in the soul ; and the singing of unauthorized hymns in unauthorized places, — all these are spoken of as objectionable features in the Whitefield regenerating processes. Mr. Turell expresses an ardent zeal in every true work of God's Spirit, and as jealous a caution against every counterfeit work. It is very clear that the revival times woke up the slumbering energies of the Medford preacher, and caused him to think and write and preach and print better than he had ever done before." — pp. 226, 227.

At this time parties were sharply arrayed against each other, in the Church militant, while neutrals found no peace. The bitter spirit excited by the advent of Whitefield, and continued by his disciples, would have effectually sundered the Congregational Church, had not the current been changed by the preparations for the Revolutionary contest, which, in turn, absorbed all thought and attention. Turell's pamphlet gave rise to a controversy with Mr. Croswell and others, which seems to have ended pretty much like other controversies, — each party retiring from the field claiming the laurels of victory.

It is a great history, — that of the Congregational Church, in its various relations and bearings, from the first settlement of the country, when *the Church* was the great power, down to the present time, retaining as it does a large, though divided influence. But where shall the writer be found ? Competent ability abounds, but where is the wise, far-reaching, prudent, impartial man, — rising above sect and party, — whose treatment of the subject and whose deductions would command the general assent ?

Mr. Turell possessed good gifts and graces as a Christian and scholar, and was united to a wife, the daughter

of the Rev. Mr. Colman, widely and well known for her lovely religious character, and literary training and intellectual accomplishments far beyond the female standard of that day. The story of her brief sojourn upon earth is affectionately told by her father, in two sermons preached at Medford, April 6, 1735, and in the memoir written by her husband. She was remarkable for early development.

“‘Before her second year was completed,’ says her father, ‘she could speak distinctly, knew her letters, and could relate many stories out of the Scriptures to the satisfaction and pleasure of the most judicious. I have heard that Governor Dudley, with other wise and polite gentlemen, have placed her on a table, and, sitting around it, owned themselves diverted with her stories. Before she was four years old (so strong and tenacious was her memory) she could say the greater part of the Assembly’s Catechism, many of the Psalms, some hundred lines of the best poetry, read distinctly, and make pertinent remarks on many things she read.’

“‘Her father devoted himself to her education. She inherited a poetic talent; and some verses written by her, in the beginning of her eleventh year, show its cultivation. In her youthful diary we find the following:—

“‘1. Thank God for my immortal soul, and that reason and understanding which distinguish me from the lower creation.

“‘2. For my birth in a Christian country, in a land of light, where the true God and Jesus Christ are known.

“‘3. For pious and honorable parents, whereby I am favored beyond many others.

“‘4. For faithful and godly ministers, who are from time to time showing me the way of salvation.

“‘5. For a polite as well as Christian education.

“‘6. For restraining grace, that I have been withheld from more open and gross violations of God’s holy laws.’

“‘Before her marriage, she laid down the following rules:—

“‘1. I will admit the addresses of no person who is not descended of pious and creditable parents.

“‘2. Who has not the character of a strict moralist,—sober, temperate, just, and honest.

“‘3. Diligent in his business, and prudent in matters.

“‘4. Fixed in his religion, a constant attender on the public worship, and who appears not in God’s house with the gravity becoming a Christian.

“‘5. Of a sweet and agreeable temper; for if he be owner of all the former good qualifications, and fails here, my life will be still uncomfortable.’

"These rules governed her in her choice. She had that elasticity of mind and buoyancy of heart which belonged to her nervous, bilious temperament. Capable of the tenderest emotion, and being a ready lover of beauty and virtue, it was not strange that she should be interested in a young gentleman whom she had seen so much at her father's house, and whom that father had taught her to respect. . . . Mr. Turell was not so much surprised as delighted to receive the following anonymous letter : —

"Sir, — You are to me the most agreeable person in the world ; and I should think myself very happy if Providence should order it as I desire ; but, sir, I must conceal my name, fearing you should expose me ; and if you do not incline to find me out, I must submit to my hard fate ; but if you comply with my desire, I am your obliged friend."

"Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Love's polarity in this letter-missive was not to be mistaken ; and the consequence of it was the marriage above recorded ; and a happy marriage it was. She loved to love

"It was her custom, after her marriage, to study and write. She made poetry her recreation. Her husband says of her : 'What greatly contributed to increase her knowledge in divinity, history, physic, controversy, as well as poetry, was her attentive hearing most that I read upon those heads through the long evenings of the winters as we sat together.'

"Her letters to her father were full of that sweet, filial reverence which ancient manners promoted more than modern. She sends him a pressing invitation, in verse, to visit her in the happy manse at Medford. Her residence then was on the spot now occupied by the house of Misses Elizabeth and Lucy Ann Brooks, — the spot on which this History has been written. In imitation of Horace, she recounts the reasons for his coming." — pp. 319 — 321.

The womanly advice which, at the age of twenty, she gave to her younger sister, will bear quoting : —

"You have now just passed your childhood, and are arrived at that stage of life which is most exposed to snares and temptations. Put away all childish things. Behave yourself womanly and like a Christian to all with whom you converse. Indulge not a passionate or fretful temper, much less a haughty or insulting carriage, towards the meanest servant in the family. Be obliging, and modest, and humble ; so shall you deserve and have the esteem of everybody. Be thankful to, and pray for, them that are so kind as to admonish you. *Be contented.* Wish not yourself in another's place, or that you had another's liberty." — p. 322.

Her temper was lovely, her faith enlightened and sincere, and all her religious and intellectual accomplishments were heightened by unusual personal grace and beauty.

She possessed a strong taste for poetry. Her own versification was easy and flowing, and much in advance of the New England standard of that day, in pleasant description and occasional pathos.

"There was in her a childlike transparency of soul, and a deep well of love, which made her the admiration and blessing of all with whom she lived. She was a model wife for a minister, as he was a model husband; and the tribute he has left to her affection, usefulness, and piety, is alike honorable to both.

"The death of Mrs. Turell brought deep and lasting sorrow to the heart of her aged father. . . . In speaking of the two sermons preached after her death, he says: 'I now make the dedication of both,—first to the beloved children of my own flock and town; and *then* to the beloved people of Medford, to whom I gave away no small part of the light of my eyes in the day I married her to their pastor.' " — p. 324.

Though many generations have appeared and vanished since the death of Mrs. Turell, the fragrance of her many virtues and accomplishments has not died away. She forms an interesting portion of Mr. Brooks's book.

He has spoken very justly of Rev. Dr. Osgood, that wise patriarch among the churches, and given a discriminating view of his character. Dr. Osgood was a man of marked qualities. There was nothing neutral about him. He will be long remembered in the Congregational Church as a positive quantity, and very honorably remembered, among other things, for his firm resistance to the spirit of inquisition sometimes manifested by Ordaining Councils. He will be remembered, too, for many years, in the numerous unwritten anecdotes connected with his social life and public ministry.

In the matter of creeds, those human contrivances to keep souls *in arctâ custodiâ*, we have been struck, in looking into the history of the Congregational Church, to find how much more liberal they were in the early day than the creeds which were afterwards adopted. Perhaps it may be that at first, as there was great unity in faith or doctrine, it was not necessary to elaborate a creed in much detail; but we are far more inclined to

think that the old independent Puritan spirit of the first century would not brook binding men's consciences in such strict measure. John Robinson was not the only one who believed that more light and truth would appear, in God's own time, than had been vouchsafed to Luther and Calvin. The earliest creed of the Medford church is characteristic of the first age of the Congregational denomination, and there is not much in it, when reasonably interpreted, to which Christians in general would object. Very different is the creed of the third Congregational Church in Medford, a church established in 1847, and entitled "The Mystic Church"; but whether named after the river, or referring to theological dogmas, we know not. This creed is substantial Calvinism to the core.

Mr. Brooks has taken a deep interest in the promotion of common-school education, evidenced in time past by public addresses, and familiar conversations, calculated to awaken general attention to the condition of our schools, and to prove that they did not partake of the general progressive spirit of the age. He labored earnestly and successfully, and did more than any other individual to prepare the way for the systematic and devoted work of Mr. Mann, commenced under more favorable auspices and crowned with eminent success. He has a right, therefore, to treat somewhat largely upon the subject in his History. He has narrated the humble beginnings, and the very gradual progress, of the common schools in Medford, during a long period, and bears testimony to their present satisfactory condition, resulting from the great impulses to which we have referred. His graphic description of the old-fashioned school-house will remind our older readers of their days of suffering.

"To speak generally, the school-houses had been as cheerful-looking objects as the county-jail, and quite as agreeable residences. Their windows were small; and some sashes had panes just as transparent as pasteboard or a felt hat, — which substitutes for glass lessened the need of blinds. The outer door had a strong lock upon it, while its two lower panels were in the vocative. The seats and desks being undivided, each pupil was compelled to mount upon the seat, and travel behind his classmates till he came to his place! This operation was a standing

trial of patience to those engaged in writing. The heavy tread of a careless boy upon the seat of a writer was not calculated to improve chirography or the temper. The smallest children, who had no desks before them, were packed so close together, that the uneasiness and pain which nature shoots through young limbs at rest subjected them to frequent admonition and ear-twigging. They who happened to be opposite the great iron stove, which stood in the centre of the room, were almost roasted; and they literally got their learning by the sweat of their brows. They who sat near this stove through a winter would be proof against any heat to be found in *this* world. So violent a fire at the centre caused the wind to rush in through the unpatented ventilators, — the cracks in the windows; and a consequence was, that, while the children nearest the stove were sweltering under more than the equatorial heat of the torrid zone, they who were nearest the windows were shivering under the icy blasts of the frozen latitudes." — p. 344.

In treating upon the early history of the common school, he awards the chief praise to Governor Prince, of Plymouth Colony, as having made, in 1663, the earliest movement upon the subject, which resulted the same year in an order "that some course may be taken that in every town there may be a schoolmaster set up, to train up children in reading and writing." This was the worthy suggestion of a very worthy man, but it applied to Plymouth alone, then an independent Colony, and followed in the wake of the Bay Colony. Our author has inadvertently done injustice to Massachusetts proper, a Colony earlier and more effectively in the field than Plymouth. The latter in 1663 simply suggested that the subject should be taken into "serious consideration," and in 1670 granted the profits that might annually accrue to the Colony "for fishing with a net or seines at Cape Cod, for mackerel, bass, or herrings, to be improved towards a free school in *some town* in this jurisdiction, . . . provided a beginning be made within a year after said grant." Thus the hint was first given in 1663; and up to 1670, there was not a single free school within the Pilgrim borders. The provision in Massachusetts, "to the end that learning may not be buried in the graves of our forefathers in church and commonwealth," bears date in 1647; and the school system was in full force here sixteen years before Prince called the attention of the Plymouth Assembly to this deeply interesting subject.

These early efforts of our fathers are deserving of all praise. When we consider the poverty of the colonists, their sparse population, and the humble condition of the large uneducated class among them, we are astonished at the bold project of popular education, and the marvelous success that attended it. The universal education of the people at the public expense was a novel idea in the history of civil government; and to the Massachusetts men, and more than all others to the clergy of Massachusetts, who were then almost the only educated men in the Colony, are we indebted for this inestimable blessing. The beginnings, of course, were humble, but they were all in the right direction, — the early dawn, assuring perfect day.

There are other subjects fully treated by the author; as the material industry of the town, and the various sources whence issue the streams of a prosperous condition.

In ship-building, who has not heard of the fame of Medford? — beginning with Governor Winthrop's bark, "The Blessing of the Bay," launched in 1631, and continuing on through successive generations, till it has now become a most important branch of productive industry. Full credit is given to Mr. Magoun, for his long, enlightened, and unwearied efforts in bringing the art to its present high and prosperous condition, — efforts which have been of exceeding great value to the country, and, as we are glad to learn, of large pecuniary emolument to himself. But we have room only to mention, in this connection, the footing of the "Register of Vessels built in Medford" from 1803 to 1854 inclusive; namely, 513 vessels (232,206 tons), valued at \$ 10,449,270.

The lives of the Medford lawyers are briefly touched upon. The eldest of this class was Timothy Bigelow, who is still remembered by many for the rank he held at the Middlesex Bar, his devotion to the interests of his clients, his rapid and earnest elocution, his professional skill, and success well assured amid many strong men from Suffolk, as well as Middlesex, his compeers and competitors. Abner Bartlett is fitly commemorated for his modest worth, and, we may add, is entitled to praise as a sound lawyer and a most useful citizen. He had no taste for the sharp conflicts of the forum, but he was

faithful to his profession, and conscientious in whatever he undertook, ever guided and governed by a high sense of honor.

"Among the inhabitants of Medford, there has not probably been a man who has served the town in so many and responsible offices as this gentleman. He was not made for a leader; he had not that kind of force, but left the race to those who coveted the laurels. He was a faithful member of the church, and all but revelled in spiritual disquisitions. As a neighbor he was most friendly, as a critic most caustic, and as a wit most ready." — p. 309.

And then there are honored names among the physicians; and the people still treasure the memory of the elder Dr. Tufts, and his no less distinguished and accomplished son, both of whom united Christian graces to professional skill, and of course exerted the most beneficent influence. Dr. Brooks was the pupil of the younger Tufts, and in all that pertains to the profession, to the daily beauty of private life, and to the character of a Christian gentleman, he was the equal of his instructor; while in the wider range of military and civic distinction he is identified with the history of the Commonwealth and of the country.

In relation to punishments for offences, Mr. Brooks is of the opinion that they were barbarous; and doubtless some of them were so; but it should be remembered they were the modes of punishment brought from England, and were in vigorous force there for more than a century afterwards. We do not go for the whipping-post, either for men or women; but we do go for almost any form of punishment that will wake up our community to a true sense of justice, and check the frauds which so abound amongst us as to deaden the moral sentiment of our people. The rogue who violates sacred pecuniary trusts, and spreads ruin all about him, is more apt to be considered as unfortunate if caught, and a martyr if punished, than to be viewed in his true character; unless, indeed, he be a sinner in humble life, with few friends and more rags, instead of walking in society in good broadcloth. We have sometimes thought it might be well for the community if those who cheat so extensively in stocks, for instance, should find other stocks provided for them in State Street and Wall Street, where they

could sit exposed to the public gaze with hands and feet well secured. Is it not about time to inaugurate these stocks anew, in the great resorts of trade?

The author has a short chapter on slavery, and relates the story of a Malay slave, some time resident in Medford, who was "sold South," and afterwards, making his escape from his Southern "owner," found his way back to Medford, where he was seized by the "owner," and, after being bound, was carried on shipboard, whence he suddenly disappeared through the instrumentality of some of the Medford people, who had no veneration for wrong.

We are told (p. 436) that the "gentlemen of Medford have always disclaimed any participation in the slave-trade." This is well. It may have been from a general disinclination, or from not being engaged in foreign trade; but if it had its cause in moral and religious considerations, it would show that the Mystic people had holier perceptions than their neighbors. This we cannot accord to them. Darkness brooded over New England, as over the Middle and Southern Colonies, until the discussions that resulted in the Revolution showed our people their great inconsistency.

The following account current of a slave voyage from Boston, in 1770, stated in the cool, mercantile debtor and creditor way, shows the deadened sentiment of the time. We copy it from the History.

Dr.		<i>The natives of Annamboo. Per contra,</i>		Cr.
1770.		1770.		
Apr. 22.	To 1 hogshead of rum . . . 110	Apr. 22.	By 1 woman-slave . . . 110	
May 1.	" rum 130	May 1.	" 1 prime woman-slave 130	
" 2.	" 1 hogshead rum . . . 105	" 2.	" 1 boy-slave, 4ft. 1in. . 105	
" 7.	" 1 hogshead rum . . . 108	" 7.	" 1 boy-slave, 4ft. 3in. 108	
" 5.	" cash in gold . . . 5oz. 2.	" 5.	" 1 prime man-slave 5oz. 2.	
" 5.	" cash in gold . . . 2oz.			
" 5.	" 2 doz. of snuff . 1oz.	" 5.	" 1 old man for a Lin-	
	—3oz. 0.		gister 3oz. 0.	

The author's views upon the peculiar institution are the true New England views, so long overlaid by cotton and trade, but now breaking out in every variety of form, and all showing the right instincts. We must, however, here remark, that he gives our ancestors too great credit in ordering the return of certain blacks to Guinea in 1646. It was not from their hatred of slavery, but from

hatred of man-stealing. One Captain Smith had brought several negroes into the Colony, "fraudulently and injuriously" according to the General Court record, October, 1645, and the person who held one of them was directed to send him to Boston in order to be returned to Africa. At the same session the Court refused to allow Smith any thing for these negroes, "they being none of his, but stolne." And in November, 1646, when they passed the order for the "negro interpreter" — perhaps the only one of Smith's captives whom they could find — to be sent to his native country, it was not against slavery that they bore "witness," but "agnt ye hainous and crying sinn of man stealing." Slavery, it seems, existed in Medford as early as 1638, and before that time Maverick had slaves at Noddle's Island; and so of others. At the very time that the General Court were bearing this witness, the "Body of Laws and Liberties" was in full force in the Colony, and one of the provisions thereof was as follows, viz.: "There shall never be any bond slaverie villinage or captivity amongst us, unles it be lawfull captives taken in just warres, and such strangers as willingly selle themselves *or are sold to us*. And these shall have all the liberties and Christian usages which the law of God established in Israell concerning such persons doeth morally require." This is the earliest provision on the subject; and although we cannot say that it establishes the "peculiar institution," it certainly recognizes the legality of the *status* of slavery. But the sharp sting of this relation was materially blunted by the provision insuring to the bondman all the liberties, &c. which the Hebrew bondsmen possessed; a condition of being very different from that of the African slave. From this cause, and also from the character of our people, the African was treated more like the hired man than the serf. He was a slave because he was the subject of involuntary service; but baptism, religious instruction, common-school instruction, the sanctity of the marriage tie, complete protection against violence and cruelty under the ægis of the law, were all his by right. In addition to this, slavery was not an hereditary condition. It embraced only those who were brought into the country as slaves. Before the adoption of our State Constitution, children born here of slave parents were born free. This,

indeed, is contrary to the old and present notion, and contrary to former usage; but it has been twice solemnly adjudicated by our highest judicial tribunal.

A very pleasant chapter is given upon the manners and customs of the early Puritan settlers, and their daily and domestic habits, followed by a long series of interesting historical items. We should be glad to quote from the chapter upon the individual Puritan, could we separate a portion from the pleasant whole, — and, indeed, from many other parts of the book; but we have already trespassed upon the limits usually assigned to notices of town histories.

This volume contains an unusual number of engravings, — portraits, and views of buildings; and closes with "The Register of Families," prepared by Mr. William H. Whitmore, of Boston, a young gentleman who has already acquired a good reputation for genealogical investigations.

In conclusion, we may say, — after some reading in town histories, — that Mr. Brooks has made a very readable and interesting book of this class. As a whole, the book is well wrought. It stands in the first line of local chronicles, and perhaps on the extreme right. It has the ring of true metal. It is a substantial contribution to this species of literature, preserves much that otherwise would soon fall out of memory, enters with true zeal into the old Puritan story, and, while not blind to the faults of our fathers, does justice to their more numerous virtues, and to those noble elements of their nature and nurture which have left enduring marks upon every succeeding generation, and are the basis of all that is valuable and permanent in our present condition of society.

J. W.

ART. VI. — REFLECTIONS.

THE common trinkets of literature are continually changing their form, but its diamonds are never out of fashion.

Many literary "effusions" proceed from water on the brain.

The pantheism of the East represents men as snow-flakes exhaled from a boundless ocean, and whirling over its surface till absorbed in its bosom ; but Christ says that we are God's children, made in his image, to grow more and more like him for ever.

Many persons give to the body the regard which belongs to the mind, and to dress the regard which belongs to the body.

The way to a wise man's heart is through his head.

We spend much of life in making blunders, and more of it in correcting them.

The chief mistake of most aspirants for greatness is their neglect of the precept, "He who would be greatest among you, let him be your servant."

Seek desert, but wait for distinction.

A man may think well and yet not act wisely. The power to see what is right is very different from the power of doing it. A man of moral energy will accomplish more with a little knowledge than a man of infirm will with much. And strength of will is generally acquired by struggling with difficulties in early life.

Condense your style to make it fine !
Men relish salt, but nauseate brine.
For "thoughts that breathe" don't waste their breath
In windy talk that tires to death,
But keep their place in "fancy's urn,"
Till wedded to the "words that burn," —
Words of electric fire, that dart
Directly to the mind and heart.

Labor is the great support of good morals. After Adam and Eve were obliged to earn their bread by the sweat of their brows, we hear no more of the serpent's tempting them.

Minds like Dr. Johnson's, acute but melancholy, resemble strong solvents consuming the vessels that hold them.

He doubles his troubles who borrows to-morrow's.

Men gravitate towards right, but are continually drawn aside by disturbing causes.

At times a nobler mood of mind,
Bringing increase
Of power and peace,
Shows for what height we were designed.

A political platform often serves as a spring-board for turning summersets.

In old age artificial distinctions fade; for old men have learned that such distinctions are insignificant compared with what they have in common.

The ambitious often fall into the ditch while gazing at the stars.

Splendid qualities break forth in dark times, like lightning from a thunder-cloud. (Lacon condensed.)

God is most merciful when he punishes most speedily.

The high-minded and the low-minded come in contact without mixing, like oil and water. Each keeps his level.

Mankind are split into companies, which follow their captains, but see little of their generals.

Experience shows that some men's force
Lies in the strength of their discourse;
And when the stirring words are said,
The speaker's energy is dead.

The price of virtue, like that of liberty, is eternal vigilance.

"The world's a stage," and the most pompous parts are often played by the poorest performers.

Men run the gauntlet in the race of life,
And win their way through toil and pain and strife.

May not the lower animals be placed here for intellectual training, and pass at death into a state in which the moral and religious sense will be developed?

The miner's life is hard,
For he digs up gold with pain;
But the miser's lot is harder,
For he buries it again.

Obscure writings, like unripe nuts, seldom pay for the trouble of getting at what is in them.

We should regulate our lives, as we do our clocks, by looking beyond this world.

A law which began with the birthday of time
Allows us no choice but to sink or to climb ;
To sink like the twinklers of night,
Which hurry at morn from on high,
Or climb like the sun in his might,
O'ercoming the whirl of the sky
And rising alone to the summit of heaven,
While planets and stars from their places are driven,
Like thousands from virtue and happiness whirled,
Unresolved, unresisting, undone by the world.*

Man finds fragments of truth, but cannot fit them together so as to form a whole.

As old copper is used for new castings, the bodies of the dead are dissolved and remoulded into those of the living.

Folly is always in fashion.

Men's countenances, more than their circumstances, indicate their condition.

Such people as try to get more than their due
Can hardly help getting bad characters too ;
And ninety-nine times in a hundred are cursed
With keeping the second and losing the first.

Weak ideas run for help to big words.

The gravity of the old is much of it assumed. When the young have grown old, they do not feel as the old used to look to them, and so do not realize the age which they have reached.

Forsaken follies send their darts
From far, to rankle in our hearts.

A blessed influence from above,
Inspiring peace and hope and love
In hearts o'ercharged with grief and care,
Oft meets half-way the humble prayer.

* Ovid's "*Nitor in adversum*," &c. may be thus translated : —

While stars and planets sink, I climb the sky,
Stemming the force that whirls them from on high.

The longer we live, the more evils we see, and the more good resulting from them.

The dependence of happiness on virtue is at first a dim conception, which gradually matures into a speculative belief, a practical principle, a solace in affliction and a support in death.

Since man left Paradise, he has come to the knowledge of good and evil only by eating of the tree of life.

The young long for lands beyond the ocean, and the old for regions beyond the grave.

FOR A SUN-DIAL.

With hand upraised, from morn to night
I preach of time's unceasing flight;
And, while earth's brightness fades away,
Point to the realms of endless day.

Men are ranged in circles round a cone; the higher the circle, the smaller the company.

The fool buys wisdom at the highest price.

Some men aim to serve others; most men to make others serve them. The former are the salt which saves the mass from corruption.

The fame of many a celebrated man is as hollow as his plaster bust.

It is safest to take for granted that others see the motives of our acts. The attempt to conceal them usually resembles the ostrich's attempt to conceal its body by hiding its head.

The progress of a great mind resembles that of a giant striding from mountain to mountain without touching the valleys.

Writers of low fictions "hold the mirror *down* to nature."

Popular writers usually deal with facts as wig-makers do with heads, supplying a graceful covering for their baldness.

The world admires genius much, but courage and fortitude more.

It is not wealth or fame which pays
The good man best for toil and pain,
But the small voice within which says
He has not lived in vain.

Low minds feel humbled by acknowledging a service.
Only the generous are grateful.

Doubt makes doing hobble.

A pleasant temper oils the wheels of life,
Which grate so harshly in the midst of strife.

The enjoyments of the selfish are low and limited,
and grow less as they advance.

The sources of poetical inspiration, though always
changing, are always abundant; for all that stirs the
feelings and the imagination is poetical.

The pain of doing right is less than the punishment of
doing wrong.

The hollow show that bloats our pride
Emaciates our good.

God's grace is proportioned to man's effort.

Follies, like fevers, run their course,
Nor end till they have spent their force.

The way of duty is the highway laid out for people to
travel in. If, for the sake of taking short cuts, they
trample through their neighbor's high grass, they are
likely to get into trouble.

A gentleman being asked to suggest an emblem of
morning, replied that he thought the best emblem of
morning was a lady in a calico gown with her hair in
papers.

May it not be true of nations, as of individuals, that
the greatest advantages do not always bring the greatest
happiness? Our people have so much food and freedom
that they kick like Jeshurun, but they do not wax fat, for
they are not contented. They resemble a man always
changing his residence to find a better one, living on the
road to die in a palace. One of our public men, quoted
by Lord Morpeth (now Earl of Carlisle), says, "There
are in the United States less misery and less happiness
than in any other country."

A little girl, four years old, on being told that she would make her eyes weak by looking at the sun, replied, "I like to be sorried for sometimes."

How often men of genius find their curse
In the keen sensibility they nurse!
Admire, but envy not, the gifted few
Consuming in the blaze that dazzles you!

No one would be praised, if the love of praise were supposed to be his only motive.

Many a man's fame dies with him, because it was kept alive only by his careful nursing.

No one was ever paid the cost
Of self-respect and virtue lost,
By those applauses which proclaim
A people's and a favorite's shame.

Self-love makes us value the praise of those whose praise of others we think worthless.

To lighten the load of life, we must increase our own strength.

The crowded paths of life converge to a dark abyss, into which the front ranks every moment plunge and disappear.

The heat of the day is greatest after the sun has passed the meridian, and the duties of life gravest after its decline has begun.

Slight accidents are serious warnings.

The world 's a school, where infants get
A knowledge of the alphabet,
And grow obedient to rule,
And fit to join a higher school.

Most new books are new only in form.

A cemetery full of natural beauties is a fit entrance to Paradise.

Conscience proves free-will.

What are the sinner's wages? Death
In self-reproach and shame;
His spirit sinks whene'er he thinks
Of Him from whom he came.

But virtue's peace to all who 've trod
In virtue's path is given,
For he who lives in fear of God
Shall die in hope of heaven.

We must watch our passions, as men in a wilderness
watch the wild animals around them.

However poor the good man be,
No other man 's so rich as he.

When the feelings are touched, the character often
starts forth like Satan at the touch of Ithuriel's spear.

Men's positions here do not always show their relative
value. The units and the tens are often transposed.

Many words are not needed men's knowledge to show,
But to cover the fact of how little they know.

Searching for truth is like sifting dirt for diamonds.
We must pursue knowledge under difficulties, or get but
little of it.

The pleasure of success and the pain of failure are
proportioned, not to the importance of the object sought,
but to the interest which has been felt in the pursuit,
and the liveliest interest is often excited by trifling
things, owing to the contagion of sympathy and many
other causes.

To hold one's head up helps to keep one's heart up.

Manners and customs are often compromises between
wisdom and folly.

He who has outlived his friends feels that his home is
beyond the grave.

Resignation to evils that can be cured does not stand
high among the Christian graces.

Political institutions, which leave men free to do what
they choose, are fit only for those who choose to do
right.

'T is strange that it should be so hard to find the right
way, when so many people are ready to show it.

The chief advantage of a new form of benevolent
effort frequently is, that it revives a zeal which was flag-

ging. When people are tired of doing good in one way, it is well to set them about doing good in another way.

A bleeding finger is more noticed than a bleeding heart.

Providence does much to save us from real evils, but we must save ourselves from imaginary ones.

To get the greatest good, a man
Must do the greatest good he can.

The nature within us is a higher subject of study than the nature without us.

Men do less than they ought, unless they do all that they can.

Much of the world's "progress" is in a wrong direction.

The aspiring disposition of our people is shown in the names which they give to their children. All the heroes and heroines of romance run barefoot about our villages.

A man without care is seldom without trouble.

E. W.

ART. VII. — PRESCOTT'S REIGN OF PHILIP THE SECOND.*

THE accomplished scholar, who, by the consent of readers and critics, both at home and abroad, bears the palm of highest fame among our historians, has again invited a widely extended circle of readers to enjoy the maturest fruits of his unwearied pen. For our own part we could have wished that he had pursued the continuous thread of the history which he had taken up in his *Ferdinand and Isabella*, and, before dealing with their great-grandson Philip, his present theme, had engaged himself with the life and exploits of his father, Charles V. Mr. Prescott leaps the space of near forty

* *History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain.* By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1855. 8vo. 2 vols. pp. 618, 610.

years, between the death of Ferdinand the Catholic, and the accession of Philip II., save as he has given us some of the episodes in its course in his volumes on the Conquest of Mexico and Peru, and in an introductory chapter to his present work. Isabella died in 1504; Ferdinand died in 1516; the conquest of Mexico dates in 1518; that of Peru and Chili ten years later. Charles V., the grandson of these Catholic sovereigns, was born in 1500, his father, Philip the Handsome of Burgundy, being the son of the Emperor Maximilian, and his mother, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, being Joanna, the Queen proprietor of Castile. The death of Charles's mother's father, in 1516, made him King of Spain, and the death of his father's father, in 1519, made him Emperor. And while we are upon this matter of royal genealogies, as preparing the way for a statement of Mr. Prescott's new and most engaging theme, we may as well add a few more facts under the same dry, but still very vital, head of pedigrees and relationship. For not among the least of the perplexities presented to us in the veritable history of the times and the characters treated in these volumes, is the fact that the royal personages whose quarrels and intrigues form so much of the subject-matter were all so near of kin, blood-relations of the closest sort, yet by no means constituting a fellowship of mutual admirers, or a "Happy Family" of sovereigns or of cabinet councillors. The only wife of Charles V., the mother of Philip II., was Isabella, daughter of Emanuel the Great of Portugal. Mary, Regent of the Netherlands, and formerly Queen of Hungary, and Eleanor, the Queen of Francis I. of France, were sisters of Charles V. Ferdinand, to whom Charles resigned the imperial crown, was his brother, and Maximilian, Ferdinand's son, married Mary, Charles's eldest daughter. Margaret of Parma, whom Philip made Regent of the Netherlands, was a natural daughter, and Don John of Austria was a natural son, of Charles. Philip II., who was born in 1527, married first the Infanta Mary, daughter of John III. of Portugal and of Catharine, another sister of Charles; and Joanna, Charles's youngest daughter, married the eldest son of the same John. Queen Mary of England, Philip's second wife, was the daughter of Henry VIII. and of

Catherine of Aragon; and so, as granddaughter of Isabella of Castile, she was cousin to Charles, to whom also she was once betrothed, though the fates designed her for the son instead of the father, and the fates made a sorry business of it even then. But as if either to rectify or to aggravate this misarrangement, when Philip yet twice more bestowed his hand in marriage, he received in both cases the hands of virgin princesses who had been destined for his son, the ill-omened Don Carlos. His third wife was Elizabeth, daughter of his cousin Henry II. of France, and his fourth wife was Anne of Austria, daughter of his cousin the Emperor Maximilian.

As a companion sketch to this summing up of the family alliances between jealous and often warring sovereigns, we should place before us the strange elements which entered into the composition of their armies. When Henry of France, the hesitating son of the Church, was at war with Philip, the most Catholic of princes, the former had for allies the Pope and the *Grand Turk*,—as Solyman had been invited into the league of Christian sovereigns! The Pope had a corps of mercenaries composed of *German Lutherans*, as had also the Constable of France, Montmorency. Indeed, some of the same sort of soldiers, who had been under Philip's standard, left him for the sake of surer and better pay under Henry. Add to these relations of kinship between rival potentates, and of heresy, and infidelity, and Catholicism between the armies called into service, the tangled complications of diplomacy, and we have some means for forming a conception of the degree of clear-headedness needed by the historian who has to deal with such materials.

Mr. Prescott has mastered the difficulties of his task, and has made a most laboriously faithful use of his rich, but often bewildering and conflicting documents. The first duty which his readers owe alike to themselves and to him is to appreciate and allow for the embarrassments of his work, by entering into a real study of its materials. His Preface informs us at length of the fresh sources for authentic writing which have been opened to his use, as well as of his diligence and zeal in availing himself of them. Some of our journals, boastful of the thrift of a few modern authors, are announcing the num-

ber of thousands of dollars which this work is bringing to its writer. We apprehend that, if the cost to which he has been put in procuring his materials were also announced, it would appear that his publisher's returns are not all clear profit. But we have no concern with the cost of the materials, while their value is everything to us. It was at an opportune time that the author undertook his work. The jealousy of a government most jealous of its archives had been relaxed just in season to serve Mr. Prescott's purposes, while a generous acknowledgment of his eminent services as a Spanish historiographer has disposed it to grant him peculiar favors. Those archives are rich, and the contents of them throw a flood of light upon events, their agencies and methods, and their intricacies of operation, besides revealing to us the motives of the prominent actors in them, — subjects which have heretofore been covered by a thick veil of mystery. The historian of those times has, until recently, been left to the necessity of conjecture, where knowledge was most essential to him; and we have to add, that such historians have yielded to the necessity of the case almost as readily as have our interpreters of the Egyptian monuments. We will not undertake an enumeration of the sources from which Mr. Prescott has obtained his precious documentary stores; it is enough to say, that the very experience which he has had of the wholly unsatisfactory and conflicting statements of those who have written without such documents, has disposed him not only to make the best use of original sources, but to practise a critic's keenest skill in harmonizing or deciding between discordant narrations. Not one in fifty of his readers will apprehend the perplexities which he has had to encounter, or the difficulties of digesting the facts and assertions which are assimilated on his delightfully smooth pages. Even when he has had before him the public despatches and the diplomatic correspondence of the august personages whose secrets he wishes to learn, and has deciphered the mysterious chirography of the sixteenth century, he has by no means made sure of his facts, or unravelled the tangled meshes of affairs. He has then to look up the more secret, the unofficial, but most effective advices and orders, which perhaps were in direct opposition to those

conveyed in due form. Two couriers might start on the same day bearing documents, some in legible characters and some in cipher, addressed to the same person, but of a most contrary import on the same matters. The letters of a prominent actor in world-wide affairs, or in private intrigues, to his superior or to his subordinate, to his friend or to his enemy, to his patron or to his creature, written during successive hours, when compared together, may disclose politic falsehoods and subtle flatteries, and abominations of deceit, such as will lead us to infer that what is gained to history is lost to our confidence in man by the study of "contemporaneous documents." That ecclesiastics should suffer the most from such exposure, is hardly a new revelation to those who know that in days of evil policy the clergy can gain political influence only through the misuse and perversion, not at all through the legitimate exercise, of their spiritual functions. Mr. Prescott reminds us that, with such a wealth of documents, and with such an insight into motives as their comparison furnishes, a faithful and judicious student knows actually more of the men and the times of which he treats, than they did who lived in them and worked out their incidents.

We can but express a wish that the author may complete his great task as successfully as he has opened and executed some very difficult stages of it. He has a long and an arduous way yet left to him. Philip exceeded by a little space the term of seventy years assigned to man. He reigned for more than forty years. The portion of his life through which his reign extended was an era big with some of the most stirring and momentous events which mark the transition from all the ancient institutions and influences of the Middle Ages in Europe to those of our modern times. Great themes present themselves to the historian, — events and characters the romance of which will be heightened, not dispelled, by the pen of the most faithful annalist, though now they stand to us as but little more than romance. The present volumes, beginning with the year 1555, carry us through thirteen of the forty-three years of Philip's reign. We must give a very brief and inadequate sketch of their contents.

The work opens with a graphic and richly wrought

delineation of a scene which is eminently suited to catch and to keep the kindled interest of the reader. It is rare that an historian finds a starting-point from so defined and remarkable an incident,—one that may be seized as the sun is painting it, and may be pictured with the accompaniment of striking details. After a few paragraphs crowded with a condensed biography of Charles V., Mr. Prescott takes us to Brussels in the month of October, 1555, to witness the imposing scene of the Emperor's renunciation of his worldly pomp, and his abdication of the highest office which Europe then had to bestow. The picturesque pageantry of that age of elaborate ceremonial, not, however, at all overdone or belittled by the tinsel or tastelessness of a display beyond the occasion, is richly drawn by the historian. Charles had invested Philip with the Order of the Golden Fleece, the proudest and most prized of all the orders of knighthood. The prince, who had been summoned from the side of his new bride in England to receive the splendid honors which his father wished to renounce, stands up with him in presence of a dignified convention of the States of the Netherlands, and listens to his parent's simple but touchingly earnest words. The Emperor leans upon the vigorous frame of the young William of Orange, of whose wise and devoted service in a better cause than that of Charles or Philip we are to read in the later volumes of this work. In the following January Charles ceded to Philip by deed the sovereignty of Castile and Aragon, with their dependencies. The Emperor still retained the title of his higher honors, as his brother Ferdinand, King of the Romans, who was to succeed to the imperial crown, had not yet received the sanction of the Electoral College. Gladly would Charles have made his son his successor to that crown, but the Diet at Ratisbon had five years before withheld a compliance with his wishes.

We extract a few impressive paragraphs from the description of this scene. Charles, says the historian, spoke in the French language, in substance as follows:—

“He was unwilling, he said, to part from his people without a few words from his own lips. It was now forty years since he had been intrusted with the sceptre of the Netherlands. He

was soon after called to take charge of a still more extensive empire, both in Spain and in Germany, involving a heavy responsibility for one so young. He had, however, endeavored earnestly to do his duty to the best of his abilities. He had been ever mindful of the interests of the dear land of his birth, but, above all, of the great interests of Christianity. His first object had been to maintain these inviolate against the infidel. In this he had been thwarted, partly by the jealousy of neighboring powers, and partly by the factions of the heretical princes of Germany.

"In the performance of his great work, he had never consulted his ease. His expeditions, in war and in peace, to France, England, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Flanders, had amounted to no less than forty. Four times he had crossed the Spanish seas, and eight times the Mediterranean. He had shrunk from no toil, while he had the strength to endure it. But a cruel malady had deprived him of that strength. Conscious of his inability to discharge the duties of his station, he had long since come to the resolution to relinquish it. From this he had been diverted only by the situation of his unfortunate parent, and by the inexperience of his son. These objections no longer existed; and he should not stand excused, in the eye of Heaven or of the world, if he should insist on still holding the reins of government when he was incapable of managing them, — when every year his incapacity must become more obvious.

"He begged them to believe that this, and no other motive, induced him to resign the sceptre which he had so long swayed. They had been to him dutiful and loving subjects; and such, he doubted not, they would prove to his successor. Above all things, he besought them to maintain the purity of the faith. If any one, in these licentious times, had admitted doubts into his bosom, let such doubts be extirpated at once. 'I know well,' he concluded, 'that, in my long administration, I have fallen into many errors, and committed some wrongs. But it was from ignorance; and, if there be any here whom I have wronged, they will believe that it was not intended, and grant me their forgiveness.'

"While the Emperor was speaking, a breathless silence pervaded the whole audience. Charles had ever been dear to the people of the Netherlands, — the land of his birth. They took a national pride in his achievements, and felt that his glory reflected a peculiar lustre on themselves. As they now gazed for the last time on that revered form, and listened to the parting admonitions from his lips, they were deeply affected, and not a dry eye was to be seen in the assembly.

"After a short interval, Charles, turning to Philip, who, in an attitude of deep respect, stood awaiting his commands, thus addressed him: 'If the vast possessions which are now bestowed on you had come by inheritance, there would be abundant cause for gratitude. How much more, when they come as a free gift, in the lifetime of your father! But, however large the debt, I shall consider it all repaid, if you only discharge your duty to your subjects. So rule over them, that men shall commend and not censure me for the part I am now acting. Go on as you have begun. Fear God; live justly; respect the laws; above all, cherish the interests of religion; and may the Almighty bless you with a son, to whom, when old and stricken with disease, you may be able to resign your kingdom with the same goodwill with which I now resign mine to you.'

"As he ceased, Philip, much affected, would have thrown himself at his father's feet, assuring him of his intention to do all in his power to merit such goodness; but Charles, raising his son, tenderly embraced him, while the tears flowed fast down his cheeks. Every one, even the most stoical, was touched by this affecting scene; 'and nothing,' says one who was present, 'was to be heard throughout the hall, but sobs and ill-suppressed moans.' Charles, exhausted by his efforts, and deadly pale, sank back upon his seat; while, with feeble accents, he exclaimed, as he gazed on his people, 'God bless you! God bless you!'

"After these emotions had somewhat subsided, Philip arose, and, delivering himself in French, briefly told the deputies of the regret which he felt at not being able to address them in their native language, and to assure them of the favor and high regard in which he held them. This would be done for him by the Bishop of Arras."—Vol. I. pp. 14–18.

Charles was then in his fifty-sixth year, but his frame, once capable of any hardship and effort of physical endurance, was now shattered by infirmities; and the gluttonous indulgence of an appetite for rich viands denied him even the possibility of restored health in his retirement. Mr. Prescott follows him back to Spain, and, in a chapter of the richest description and narrative, presents to us his course of life in the monastery at Yuste, till the end came to him on September 21, 1558. Our author has been subjected, at this point of his story, to a disappointment which, we can well conceive, must have been a grievous one, though we do not infer it from the modest and dignified reference which he makes to it. He had written his chapter on the "Latter Days of

Charles V." in the summer of 1851, having enjoyed the high satisfaction of believing that he would be the first to communicate to English readers the new and abundant information furnished upon that romantic theme by the opening to scholars of the rich manuscript treasures in the archives of Simancas. But in the interval that has transpired, the publication of the original documents by M. Gachard, of the works of M. Pichot and M. Mignet, and of the fine volume by Mr. Stirling, entitled "*The Cloister Life of Charles V.*," has deprived Mr. Prescott of his anticipated pleasure.

Still he has found abundant occasion for the exercise of his critical skill upon these documents, and the reader will note how well his practised pen has wrought upon materials which, if they have not the freshest charm of novelty in his pages, have the value of a careful and authentic digest of often conflicting and unreliable details. The graceful acknowledgment which Mr. Prescott makes of the merits of Mr. Stirling's volume, is a fine illustration of a spirit that can commend another to eyes and ears which it had hoped to win to its own labors.*

Our author has presented the character of Charles certainly with a strong and distinct individuality, in which the influences of his own age, far from being passively yielded to, were moulded and used by the energy of his master spirit. We believe that his character is also presented with fidelity, and that any writer who shall henceforward employ the abundant materials which exist to work out a more adequate biography than Dr. Robertson's, will find no occasion for essentially modify-

* Considering that Mr. Prescott has paid so generous a tribute to Mr. Stirling, both at the beginning and the end of the chapter under notice, we read with "surprise" the following sentence in an article on the work before us in Putnam's Magazine for January, 1856: "We must confess our surprise at finding no reference, in this part of the sketch, to the careful and thorough researches of Mr. Stirling, — an omission which is the more remarkable, that Mr. Prescott is by no means sparing in his use of complimentary notes." Surely the writer must confess also to some inadvertence on his own part. And while we are referring to this Magazine article, we would suggest that the writer adds unnecessarily to the burden now resting upon Mr. Prescott, and extends the claims which readers have upon him for the completion of his work, by intimating that it must treat of the Thirty Years' War. The date from which that protracted and continuous struggle begins is twenty years after the death of Philip.

ing the view of the Emperor which is set forth in these pages. There was a massiveness of mind in Charles, and a sort of politic spirit of temporizing when he would not actually yield his own will to the difficulty of circumstances. Mr. Prescott makes us understand the real difference in the characters of the father and the son, which in some cases dictated a difference of policy, and in other cases pursued the same policy by different methods; so that, though the two had many strong points of resemblance, they nevertheless represent to us the workings and the results of two very unlike spirits. Charles was by birth a Fleming, and Philip was by birth a Spaniard. The former was held in a regard strangely mingled of honor and fear by the Netherlanders, while the latter was simply hated by them. Yet Charles had laid the foundation and provided the elements of all the troubles which Philip there encountered, while the seeds of dissension sown by the father had to be dealt with by the son as they had grown and were ripening into bitter fruits.

Our author then gives us a finely drawn sketch of Philip's youth and training, leaving us to gather together the emphatic qualities of his manhood, as from his earliest years they were manifested, to be only intensified in his maturity. If there be any trait in that character which relieves its sombre gloom, its dark and cruel malignity, and its unscrupulous tenacity in working out under a calm reserve its dire purposes, it is a sort of consistency between all its exhibitions of itself, which manifests a *principle* of action; while, at the same time, as that principle was manifestly guided by what then passed for the highest rule of loyalty to religion, we have to visit some of the severity of our judgment, which would otherwise fall on the man, upon that hideous code of ethics under which his ecclesiastical tutors had trained him. Philip was indeed the favorite pupil of the old Spanish church system. It would be difficult, we think, to make a fair distribution of his hateful purposes and his cruel deeds, without assigning them in equal measurements to his character and his creed. A type of his whole course, and of his ruling principle through life, is furnished us in the arrangements made by him for the secret execution of Montigny. Philip sent three officials

to the prison to accomplish that dark deed: a really pious priest, to break the intelligence of his doom to the prisoner, and to afford him true religious consolation for his last few hours; a strong-handed ruffian, who would throttle his victim, so as to leave, as nearly as possible, the appearance of a natural death; and a notary, to make a legal record of the proceedings, either to invite the scrutiny or to defy the judgment of posterity. Philip would not have put to death his worst enemy without offering him, and urging upon him, a priestly shriving; but after that process had been performed, Philip could have looked upon the form of any man or woman, however nearly related to him, while it was subjected to slow torture.

Mr. Prescott has given us a brilliant relation of Philip's voyage and journey from Spain in 1548, when he was twenty years old, to visit his father at Brussels. The subject calls out all the author's fertility of knowledge and imagery, in rehearsing to us the opinions and manners of the time. The mode and course of travel, the picturesque adornments of the cavalcade and the court ceremonial, the incidental accounts of the men of mark, whose fortunes are afterwards to mingle in the stream of the chief narrative, make these fascinating pages most welcome in a work which has so much to try the feelings of a reader. Admirably too are we made to realize the grounds upon which, in this journey, the future subjects of the young prince learned to dislike and to dread him. His more politic father sought in vain to prompt him to those graces of demeanor which alone can win the hearts of men and women. The Electoral Diet had good reasons for declining, two years after this visit, to recognize the sullen wearer of those gloomy brows as the head of the empire.

The reader of English history is always made to feel a dreary chill passing over his sympathies as he comes to that page in its annals which Mr. Prescott has to write anew,—and not without additional interest,—in relating the marriage of Philip with Mary. He by no means relieves the sense of unfitness, the shock of disgust even, which the discordancy and incongruity with all the other episodes of English history of that odious alliance excite within us. We really believe, that if the

father of Pocahontas had gone from our shores as an accepted suitor of Mary, and had become her husband, we should have found it more easy to work the incident into the diversified, but otherwise homogeneous elements of that history. Summoned from the over-fond and unreturned caresses of his bride to receive from his father, as already related, the royalty which that father wished to renounce, Philip afterwards made but one short visit to England; and in four years after his marriage, while he was at Brussels, he received the tidings of Mary's death. In a month afterwards he made offers of marriage to her successor, Elizabeth. Seeing that the fates had determined that Philip should be the husband of one of the sovereigns of England, we can but wish that he had fallen under the matrimonial supervision of Elizabeth; for if certain lectures from any one could have had a much-needed effect on him, we are confident that that imperious dame would have given them a most hopeful enforcement. And more than this, if Philip in that case had not profited by her discipline, the probability is that the English people would have anticipated the process of that "High Court" which afterwards sat on "the Royal Martyr," and would have been led, by their honest instincts as to the fitnesses of things, to have used the stake instead of the headsman's axe to perfect their sentence.

Mr. Prescott's volumes, necessarily given up, as we have intimated, to a series of episodes, now relate, in two vigorous chapters, the grounds and incidents of the struggle between Pope Paul IV. and Philip for the latter's possessions in Southern Italy. Here comes upon the stage the Duke of Alva, who, as victor in Philip's behalf as to the main issue in the strife, yielded to that bitterest of all the terms of peace which compelled him to throw himself at the feet of the Pontiff, and sue for pardon for having contended with the head of the Church. Then comes another episode, in two more chapters, enriched with highly exciting narrative and momentous incidents, devoted to Philip's war with Henry II. of France, which ended with the espousal by the former of the daughter of the latter, as his third bride, — the intended bride of Don Carlos. Philip returns to Spain to resume his government, and, amid all the pageantry of his reception, he is

an unshocked, apparently a most gratified, spectator of an *auto de fé*. We transfer to our pages the all too faithful description of this shocking spectacle. In the great square, in front of the church of St. Francis, at Valladolid, a platform had been raised for the inquisitors, a gallery for the royal spectators, and a scaffold for the victims.

“ At six in the morning all the bells in the capital began to toll, and a solemn procession was seen to move from the dismal fortress of the Inquisition. In the van marched a body of troops, to secure a free passage for the procession. Then came the condemned, each attended by two familiars of the Holy Office, and those who were to suffer at the stake by two friars, in addition, exhorting the heretic to abjure his errors. Those admitted to penitence wore a sable dress; while the unfortunate martyr was enveloped in a loose sack of yellow cloth,—the *san benito*,—with his head surmounted by a cap of pasteboard of a conical form, which, together with the cloak, was embroidered with figures of flames and of devils fanning and feeding them; all emblematical of the destiny of the heretic's soul in the world to come, as well as of his body in the present. Then came the magistrates of the city, the judges of the courts, the ecclesiastical orders, and the nobles of the land, on horseback. These were followed by the members of the dread tribunal, and the fiscal, bearing a standard of crimson damask, on one side of which were displayed the arms of the Inquisition, and on the other the insignia of its founders, Sixtus the Fifth and Ferdinand the Catholic. Next came a numerous train of familiars, well mounted, among whom were many of the gentry of the province, proud to act as the body-guard of the Holy Office. The rear was brought up by an immense concourse of the common people, stimulated on the present occasion, no doubt, by the loyal desire to see their new sovereign, as well as by the ambition to share in the triumphs of the *auto de fé*. The number thus drawn together from the capital and the country, far exceeding what was usual on such occasions, is estimated by one present at full two hundred thousand.

“ As the multitude defiled into the square, the inquisitors took their place on the seats prepared for their reception. The condemned were conducted to the scaffold, and the royal station was occupied by Philip, with the different members of his household. At his side sat his sister, the late regent, his son, Don Carlos, his nephew, Alexander Farnese, several foreign ambassadors, and the principal grandees and higher ecclesiastics in attendance on the court. It was an august assembly of the greatest and

the proudest in the land. But the most indifferent spectator, who had a spark of humanity in his bosom, might have turned with feelings of admiration from this array of worldly power, to the poor martyr, who, with no support but what he drew from within, was prepared to defy this power, and to lay down his life in vindication of the rights of conscience. Some there may have been, in that large concourse, who shared in these sentiments. But their number was small indeed in comparison with those who looked on the wretched victim as the enemy of God, and his approaching sacrifice as the most glorious triumph of the cross.

"The ceremonies began with a sermon, 'the sermon of the faith,' by the Bishop of Zamora. The subject of it may well be guessed, from the occasion. It was no doubt plentifully larded with texts of Scripture, and, unless the preacher departed from the fashion of the time, with passages from the heathen writers, however much out of place they may seem in an orthodox discourse.

"When the bishop had concluded, the grand-inquisitor administered an oath to the assembled multitude, who on their knees solemnly swore to defend the Inquisition, to maintain the purity of the faith, and to inform against any one who should swerve from it. As Philip repeated an oath of similar import, he suited the action to the word, and, rising from his seat, drew his sword from its scabbard, as if to announce himself the determined champion of the Holy Office. In the earlier *autos* of the Moorish and Jewish infidels, so humiliating an oath had never been exacted from the sovereign.

"After this, the secretary of the tribunal read aloud an instrument reciting the grounds for the conviction of the prisoners, and the respective sentences pronounced against them. Those who were to be admitted to penitence, each, as his sentence was proclaimed, knelt down, and, with his hands on the missal, solemnly abjured his errors, and was absolved by the grand-inquisitor. The absolution, however, was not so entire as to relieve the offender from the penalty of his transgressions in this world. Some were doomed to perpetual imprisonment in the cells of the Inquisition, others to lighter penances. All were doomed to the confiscation of their property, — a point of too great moment to the welfare of the tribunal ever to be omitted. Besides this, in many cases the offender, and, by a glaring perversion of justice, his immediate descendants, were rendered for ever ineligible to public office of any kind, and their names branded with perpetual infamy. Thus blighted in fortune and in character, they were said, in the soft language of the Inquisition, to be *reconciled*.

"As these unfortunates were remanded, under a strong guard, to their prisons, all eyes were turned on the little company of

martyrs, who, clothed in the ignominious garb of the *san benito*, stood waiting the sentence of their judges, — with cords round their necks, and in their hands a cross, or sometimes an inverted torch, typical of their own speedy dissolution. The interest of the spectators was still further excited, in the present instance, by the fact that several of these victims were not only illustrious for their rank, but yet more so for their talents and virtues. In their haggard looks, their emaciated forms, and too often, alas! their distorted limbs, it was easy to read the story of their sufferings in their long imprisonment, for some of them had been confined in the dark cells of the Inquisition much more than a year. Yet their countenances, though haggard, far from showing any signs of weakness or fear, were lighted up with the glow of holy enthusiasm, as of men prepared to seal their testimony with their blood.

“ When that part of the process showing the grounds of their conviction had been read, the grand-inquisitor consigned them to the hands of the corregidor of the city, beseeching him to deal with the prisoners *in all kindness and mercy*; a honeyed, but most hypocritical phrase, since no choice was left to the civil magistrate but to execute the terrible sentence of the law against heretics, the preparations for which had been made by him a week before.

“ The whole number of convicts amounted to thirty, of whom sixteen were *reconciled*, and the remainder *relaxed* to the secular arm, — in other words, turned over to the civil magistrate for execution. There were few of those thus condemned who, when brought to the stake, did not so far shrink from the dreadful doom that awaited them, as to consent to purchase a commutation of it by confession before they died; in which case they were strangled by the *garrote*, before their bodies were thrown into the flames.

“ Of the present number, there were only two whose constancy triumphed to the last over the dread of suffering, and who refused to purchase any mitigation of it by a compromise with conscience. The names of these martyrs should be engraven on the record of history.

“ One of them was Don Carlos de Seso, a noble Florentine, who had stood high in the favor of Charles the Fifth. Being united with a lady of rank in Castile, he removed to that country, and took up his residence in Valladolid. He had become a convert to the Lutheran doctrines, which he first communicated to his own family, and afterwards showed equal zeal in propagating among the people of Valladolid and its neighborhood. In short, there was no man to whose untiring and intrepid labors the cause of the Reformed religion in Spain was more indebted. He was, of course, a conspicuous mark for the Inquisition.

“During the fifteen months in which he lay in its gloomy cells, cut off from human sympathy and support, his constancy remained unshaken. The night preceding his execution, when his sentence had been announced to him, De Seso called for writing materials. It was thought he designed to propitiate his judges by a full confession of his errors. But the confession he made was of another kind. He insisted on the errors of the Romish Church, and avowed his unshaken trust in the great truths of the Reformation. The document, covering two sheets of paper, is pronounced by the secretary of the Inquisition to be a composition equally remarkable for its energy and precision. When led before the royal gallery, on his way to the place of execution, De Seso pathetically exclaimed to Philip, ‘Is it thus that you allow your innocent subjects to be persecuted?’ To which the king made the memorable reply, ‘If it were my own son, I would fetch the wood to burn him, were he such a wretch as thou art!’ It was certainly a characteristic answer.

“At the stake De Seso showed the same unshaken constancy, bearing his testimony to the truth of the great cause for which he gave up his life. As the flames crept slowly around him, he called on the soldiers to heap up the fagots, that his agonies might be sooner ended; and his executioners, indignant at the obstinacy — the heroism — of the martyr, were not slow in obeying his commands.

“The companion and fellow-sufferer of De Seso was Domingo de Roxas, son of the Marquis de Poza, an unhappy noble, who had seen five of his family, including his eldest son, condemned to various humiliating penances by the Inquisition for their heretical opinions. This one was now to suffer death. De Roxas was a Dominican monk. It is singular that this order, from which the ministers of the Holy Office were particularly taken, furnished many proselytes to the Reformed religion. De Roxas, as was the usage with ecclesiastics, was allowed to retain his sacerdotal habit until his sentence had been read, when he was degraded from his ecclesiastical rank, his vestments were stripped off one after another, and the hideous dress of the *san benito* thrown over him, amid the shouts and derision of the populace. Thus apparelled, he made an attempt to address the spectators around the scaffold; but no sooner did he begin to raise his voice against the errors and cruelties of Rome, than Philip indignantly commanded him to be gagged. The gag was a piece of cleft wood, which, forcibly compressing the tongue, had the additional advantage of causing great pain while it silenced the offender. Even when he was bound to the stake, the gag, though contrary to custom, was suffered to remain in the mouth of De Roxas, as if his enemies dreaded the effects of an eloquence that triumphed over the anguish of death.” — Vol. I. pp. 427–435.

The author's pen sets before us an elaborate account of that ecclesiastical policy by which, with demon-like cunning and persevering ruthlessness of cruelty, the Inquisition suppressed the spirit of free thought in Spain. Spain then had her opportunity among the nations of Europe, to welcome that breaking light of truth which, shining first upon the soul of man, glances next with its mild and genial beams upon all the interests that engage his mind, his heart, his enterprise, and his hands. Spain made her choice between accepting or resisting this light. Her retribution has been fearfully severe for her wrong choice. But is not her retribution just? Does it not convey to us, in the subdued tones of a long and a late avengement, the echoes of those unpitied sobs, and those heroic protests, and those patient martyrdoms, which attended the savage obsequies of Protestantism?

The larger portion of the continuous narrative of this work is devoted to the troubles in the Netherlands. Philip, on returning to Spain, left his natural sister, Margaret of Parma, in the regency, subject, however, to councils of advisers, of which Granvelle, an ambitious but wise, and afterwards a still wiser, ecclesiastic and minister, was the potent spirit. The method which Philip planned for the government, and the measures by which he had designed, through the establishment of the Inquisition and other ecclesiastical oppressions, to work out his own policy by his representatives, are detailed with great clearness by our author. So full and discriminating is the information offered to the reader, that his curiosity, highly wrought up into painful interest, is engaged to follow the development of the story as earnestly as if he were watching the course of an anxious issue not yet decided. Mr. Prescott gives us a very animated sketch of the condition of the Low Countries, in thrift and in wealth, in the character and distribution of their population in numerous splendid cities and industrious towns, in their manufactures, their mercantile eminence and commerce, and in the spirit and tendencies of the people. The Low Countries were indeed worth to Philip more than the Indies; they were the very gem of his crown. Our author enters with a noble spirit of discrimination and judicial impartiality upon the earlier incidents of that long-protracted and slowly ripening strife, which, involving the revolt of the

Netherlands, ended in their independence. The tale is complicated and is filled with tragedies. With all its striking remains of an antique architecture, and all its treasures of art, Belgium has no spectacle to attract the thoughtful visitor from this continent by a stronger hold upon his feelings than does the market-place where the loved and eminent Counts Egmont and Hoorne gave up their lives amid the groans and curses of the almost infuriated spectators. The groans expressed the anguish of the people at the execution of the two patriots who were all but adored by them. The curses were for the cruel Alva.

We acknowledge that the judicial calmness of Mr. Prescott, which, however, by no means passes into coldness, has exercised a discreet power over our own feelings as we read again, with the best light, the narrative of the troubles in the Netherlands. Counts Egmont and Hoorne were technically traitors. The ruthless Alva, and his yet more cruel master, were disciples of the Roman Church. Their loyalty to their faith was as sincere a sentiment as their hearts could entertain or yield to;—it was their chivalry. Alva had given the best token of the power which that sentiment had over his heart, when, though victor, he bowed his neck and sued for pardon from the proud chief Pontiff. If the monarch and his viceroy were to govern, and if Spanish rule was to sway the Netherlands, and the Roman Church was to deepen its demon-like clutch upon the rising spirit of a free faith there, the policy pursued was the right one. Relentless as it was, unsparing, vengeful beyond any other epithet that can be used in describing it, it was consistent with its own cause and with its own aim. So far as the feeling of loyalty to king and Church can palliate the direful career of Alva, and so far as loyalty to the Church can cover this and other elements of the policy of Philip, they are entitled to a judgment which tries only the motive, and allows something for the blindness and passion which follow that motive, even when it has mistaken a fiendlike passion for a noble zeal. Nor were the instigators of the atrocious cruelties practised in the Netherlands wholly unexcused in their own eyes by provocations from the fanaticism of their opponents. When the spoilers of sanctuaries, the image-breakers, the robbers

of shrines, made a riot of sacrilege, and, not content with listening to the soul-stirring appeals of the first Protestant preachers, followed the bad advice of such mad zealots as Marnix, and proceeded to insult the fondest sanctities of their own land and their own brethren, they invited retribution. No tidings could have been borne to the king in Spain more suited to inflame his vengeance, and to warrant its exercise, to his own convictions, as a real inspiration, than those which related to him the violence of the iconoclasts in desecrating the churches, and in polluting the sacred symbols of the faith. And yet we may not forget that a sentiment of loyalty was also in the hearts of those goaded Protestants, the heralds of a freer and a wiser age, the experimenters under the first exercises of a spiritual faith. Their loyalty recognized a higher and more august sway than that of earthly king or pontiff. They, too, had convictions to follow, a sworn allegiance to God and truth to obey, and a cause to assert and lead on to triumph.

In close connection with an account of the fearfully consistent and unrelenting policy of Alva and his Council of Blood in the Netherlands, the author gives a most melting narrative of the cruel fate of Montigny in Spain, whither he had gone as an agent of the suffering party in the Low Countries. Following this is a highly dramatic and extended episode, relating the rise and growth, the strength and the hostile attitude, of the Ottoman Empire at a time when Philip II. was looked to as bound to be the barrier against its overrunning Europe. The siege of Malta by these infidel hosts and their piratical allies, with its defence by the Knights of St. John, fills a large space in Mr. Prescott's second volume. If it does not prove that this stirring episode is so fully recounted at the expense of curtailment for any other of the momentous incidents of Philip's reign, we certainly shall not regret the number of pages devoted to that exciting narrative. It is told with a marvellous power and fullness of detail, and is made to carry with it the burning interest of the reader. Nor indeed can any one fairly complain that the author has disproportionately treated this incident in his long story. If readers disposed to make that complaint had lived in Spain at the time

when it occurred, we are inclined to think that their dread of these Mussulman marauders and their allies would have borne about an equal proportion to the rest of their interests and fears. The description of the siege gives Mr. Prescott an admirable occasion for presenting to us one of the most renowned of the knightly orders of the time, with sketches of its most famous members and their discipline, as well as of developing some of the political intrigues and the mode of warfare of that age.

The last three chapters of the second volume have an intensely painful interest, as they are devoted to the ill-starred Don Carlos, and to the young Queen, who followed him so soon in death. Schiller, Alfieri, Otway, and others, have wrought that theme into their tragic numbers, and the world has given it a place among its saddest records of romance and of guilt. Mr. Prescott deals with it with the sympathies of a refined and a cultivated man, but with the stern fidelity of an historian. He tells us that the mystery is not yet cleared up. There is a sealed box yet to be discovered and opened. He, however, disposes satisfactorily of the popular invention that there was a wicked intimacy between Don Carlos and his step-mother. He describes the strange, disordered life of the Prince of the Asturias, his wilful youth and the excesses of his early manhood, his passionate acts and plots, involving suspicions of a purpose to lead the heretics in the Netherlands and an inclination to take the life of his father, and gives us a very elaborate account of his seizure and imprisonment by that father, with a rehearsal of the course pursued with him, of the method of his death, and the consequent behavior of the bereaved parent. What a scene is that which the historian paints to us, of the sick Don Carlos, while yet a youth, lying in his bed with the disentombed corpse of Didacius (afterwards St.) by his side, and the cold shroud taken from the skeleton to be bound around his fevered brow! Shall we ever know all the truth about the monarch and this son? We confess that the bold and unqualified charge afterwards made against Philip by the Prince of Orange, of having procured the death of Don Carlos and the Queen, prevails much with us in holding him guilty of the enormity as respects his son. We appreciate the rigid candor and the painstaking fidelity of our

historian in arbitrating upon this dread issue, after he has searched all his sources of accurate information and drawn his cautious inferences.

We think that our author has necessarily, as well as wisely, chosen, of the two courses or methods for his history, that which treats of events according to their subjects, rather than that which follows dates and arranges events chronologically. The history of the reign of a monarch whose kingdom embraced the Indies, the Low Countries, Franche Comté, Naples, and Milan, as well as Spain, and involved a world of exciting incidents and the fortunes of two generations, must necessarily shift from scene to scene, and drop the thread of one story to take up that of another. The reader must make some effort to bear in mind the contemporaneous procession of men and events in different places. He must assign to the same or to successive days, months, and years, the incidents which the historian is compelled to relate under pages widely separated, because he is writing the annals of an extended space of the earth. Thus Philip had on his heart the burden of Counts Egmont and Hoorne, and of Don Carlos, at the same time, and only a month intervened between the death of the two first and that of the last.

Mr. Prescott has yet, as we have already said, a long task before him, as thirty years of crowded and momentous interests remain to be chronicled. We hope that he will give us from his point of view, so favorable to truth and charity, at least one chapter on the Council of Trent, whose sessions were held between 1545 and 1564. He must give us another brilliant episode upon Philip's empire over this continent. He has opened the career of a monarch whose splendid possessions were within a hundred years afterwards stripped from the crown by the peace of the Pyrenees, of Aix la Chapelle, and of Nimeguen. He has yet to tell us of the rupture between Spain and England, of the disastrous fate of the "Invincible Armada," of the losses in America, of the capture of Cadiz, of the troubles in the Low Countries under the later regencies, and of Prince Maurice's success there, as well as of the campaigns and the assassination of William of Orange, in 1584, and of the treaty of Vervins with France, besides anatomizing and analyzing the

characters and the course of at least a score of the men of mark, who acted in these great dramas.

How glorious is the province of the historian! To him, more even than to the monarch of whose reign and realm he gives us so full and brilliant a chronicle, belongs the real empire, with its wealth and wisdom, its power and its resources, and its dominion over the feelings of men. We are the subjects of the historian while we read his pages. He extends our lives back through the past, and divides, with the prophet of the future, a sway over the souls of men.

It would be premature for us here to criticise the philosophical principles which Mr. Prescott develops or recognizes in this portion of an uncompleted work, though it is by far the boldest and the most exacting of his undertakings, and shows the growth of his own mind, and displays a power and grasp of thought beyond any other of his efforts. We admire most of all his measured and self-restrained deliberation of judgment, his calm impartiality, and his genial charity. He has a kind word even for "Bloody Mary"; he does not sentence even Alva as a monster, and what he will have to say of Philip at last, we know will not be without a warrant for severity beyond what his words will express. Mr. Prescott is not one of the intense writers of the No-Popery school. He is forbearing, judicious, and just. He is skilled in developing those intricate relations of principle and prejudice, and those minglings of motives, which, while they dim the glory of the best men, relieve the ignominy of the worst in the tortuous complications of public affairs. The philosophical lessons to be deduced and moralized upon from these chronicles of a half-century of the most pregnant annals of time are almost too large for any one mind to grasp. They ought rather to be left for monographs, and for specialties. That we shall have in this history, when completed, an adequate portraiture of the men and the times which it brings into our view, is but a reasonable expectation, assured by what is now in our hands.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Sin and Redemption: a Series of Sermons. To which is added an Oration on Moral Freedom. By D. N. SHELDON, D.D., Pastor of the Elm Street Baptist Church, in Bath, Me. New York: Sheldon, Lamport, and Blakeman. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 332.

THIS book will engage attention, partly for its own sake, perhaps more from the position of its author. Dr. Sheldon stands high in the Baptist denomination, and was for some time President of Waterville College. Whether he resigned that office from his own preferences, or found that his theological tendencies were not agreeable to the friends of the College, we are not informed. Since leaving there he has been pastor of a Baptist church in Bath, and is said to carry most of his people with him in his views of truth and Christian doctrine. Those views, so far as declared in the volume before us, are decidedly anti-Calvinistic, and in harmony with those usually advocated in this journal. Not that we claim Dr. Sheldon as one of ourselves. He says nothing of Unity or Trinity, and we have no means of knowing how he stands in relation to that controversy. Nor are we anxious to know. The topics here treated are far more important than the question of Christ's or God's personal essence. The only declaration we remember on that point is found in the Preface to this volume, and bears upon the whole matter of the writer's creed.

"I have no sympathy with the timidity which may deter any from an open declaration of their views, because these views may be thought to conflict with an accredited standard of Orthodoxy. Though numbering myself with the Orthodox so called, on the subject of the Divinity of our Lord, and on other subjects, I must yet disavow altogether the binding authority of any extra-Scriptural definitions and statements of Orthodoxy. The only Orthodoxy which I venerate is truth, and what may be shown to have the marks of truth. I believe that much of the received dogmatic theology needs to be searchingly re-examined and amended. What is held a fundamental truth in ethics, must not be contradicted by anything in our theological systems. . . . Our faith in Scripture would receive a fearful recoil if Scripture were found, as it is not, teaching anything in conflict with our moral judgments; for deeper than our reverence for any external revelation, underlying this reverence and the chief foundation of it, must be our reverence for God and for moral truth."

After two discourses on the "Being of God shown from his

Works," and the "Creation of Man in the Divine Image," — discourses which contain little that is original, and nothing to us objectionable, — Dr. Sheldon treats of the "Temptation and Fall," and their consequences to Adam's posterity. Those consequences he regards as wholly moral, — not physical, not penal, nor connected at all with inheritance or imputation. Adam was created as we are, and sinned as we sin; we are created as Adam was, and fall as he fell, through temptation and weakness. A difference of course there is in outward condition and moral exposure, but not a difference of nature or moral constitution. "I know of no shadow of a reason for supposing that any faculty or element was put into the constitution of Adam, which is not found now in the constitution of every living human being. Sure I am that there is not a hint in the Bible, Old Testament or New, that Adam had a single natural power or endowment which his descendants do not have." And in a further discourse on the "Threatened Death," the writer makes that death to be purely moral, having no relation to physical death, the law of mortality being a law of all organized beings, not beginning then, but existing and reigning "in the long period anterior to the creation of Adam." Not denying that the sin of the soul may affect the condition and dissolution of the body, he insists: "It is not to the credit of so many preachers and teachers of religion, that they still often speak of physical death, not only in men, but also in all animals, as the fruit of our first parents' sin; and it is time that, in this respect, a more Scriptural theology, better in harmony also with fact, with experience, and with nature, were taught."

The actual influence of Adam's disobedience on the sinfulness of his posterity, Dr. Sheldon illustrates, as Paul does, by the connection between Christ's obedience and the righteousness of the believer. Neither comes by divine decree or by transfer, or any kind of necessity. Both are alike free, moral, individual. "We are just as little made sinners without our agency, as we are restored to righteousness without our agency. Adam has just as little involved us in condemnation without our fault, as Christ delivers us from condemnation without our earnest co-operation." "Adam has exerted no irresistibly determining influence on the one side, and Christ exerts no such influence on the other side." "Too long has a large portion of the Christian Church lain under the incubus of an unsound and chilling theology in these respects. The nightmare must be thrown off, or the very lifeblood of intelligent piety will be congealed in death; and the Church, in just thinking, will fall behind the world, and be unfitted to guide it in the path of divine knowledge and understanding."

historian in arbitrating upon this dread issue, after he has searched all his sources of accurate information and drawn his cautious inferences.

We think that our author has necessarily, as well as wisely, chosen, of the two courses or methods for his history, that which treats of events according to their subjects, rather than that which follows dates and arranges events chronologically. The history of the reign of a monarch whose kingdom embraced the Indies, the Low Countries, Franche Comté, Naples, and Milan, as well as Spain, and involved a world of exciting incidents and the fortunes of two generations, must necessarily shift from scene to scene, and drop the thread of one story to take up that of another. The reader must make some effort to bear in mind the contemporaneous procession of men and events in different places. He must assign to the same or to successive days, months, and years, the incidents which the historian is compelled to relate under pages widely separated, because he is writing the annals of an extended space of the earth. Thus Philip had on his heart the burden of Counts Egmont and Hoorne, and of Don Carlos, at the same time, and only a month intervened between the death of the two first and that of the last.

Mr. Prescott has yet, as we have already said, a long task before him, as thirty years of crowded and momentous interests remain to be chronicled. We hope that he will give us from his point of view, so favorable to truth and charity, at least one chapter on the Council of Trent, whose sessions were held between 1545 and 1564. He must give us another brilliant episode upon Philip's empire over this continent. He has opened the career of a monarch whose splendid possessions were within a hundred years afterwards stripped from the crown by the peace of the Pyrenees, of Aix la Chapelle, and of Nimeguen. He has yet to tell us of the rupture between Spain and England, of the disastrous fate of the "Invincible Armada," of the losses in America, of the capture of Cadiz, of the troubles in the Low Countries under the later regencies, and of Prince Maurice's success there, as well as of the campaigns and the assassination of William of Orange, in 1584, and of the treaty of Vervins with France, besides anatomizing and analyzing the

characters and the course of at least a score of the men of mark, who acted in these great dramas.

How glorious is the province of the historian! To him, more even than to the monarch of whose reign and realm he gives us so full and brilliant a chronicle, belongs the real empire, with its wealth and wisdom, its power and its resources, and its dominion over the feelings of men. We are the subjects of the historian while we read his pages. He extends our lives back through the past, and divides, with the prophet of the future, a sway over the souls of men.

It would be premature for us here to criticise the philosophical principles which Mr. Prescott develops or recognizes in this portion of an uncompleted work, though it is by far the boldest and the most exacting of his undertakings, and shows the growth of his own mind, and displays a power and grasp of thought beyond any other of his efforts. We admire most of all his measured and self-restrained deliberation of judgment, his calm impartiality, and his genial charity. He has a kind word even for "Bloody Mary"; he does not sentence even Alva as a monster, and what he will have to say of Philip at last, we know will not be without a warrant for severity beyond what his words will express. Mr. Prescott is not one of the intense writers of the No-Popery school. He is forbearing, judicious, and just. He is skilled in developing those intricate relations of principle and prejudice, and those minglings of motives, which, while they dim the glory of the best men, relieve the ignominy of the worst in the tortuous complications of public affairs. The philosophical lessons to be deduced and moralized upon from these chronicles of a half-century of the most pregnant annals of time are almost too large for any one mind to grasp. They ought rather to be left for monographs, and for specialties. That we shall have in this history, when completed, an adequate portraiture of the men and the times which it brings into our view, is but a reasonable expectation, assured by what is now in our hands.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Sin and Redemption: a Series of Sermons. To which is added an Oration on Moral Freedom. By D. N. SHELDON, D.D., Pastor of the Elm Street Baptist Church, in Bath, Me. New York: Sheldon, Lamport, and Blakeman. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 332.

THIS book will engage attention, partly for its own sake, perhaps more from the position of its author. Dr. Sheldon stands high in the Baptist denomination, and was for some time President of Waterville College. Whether he resigned that office from his own preferences, or found that his theological tendencies were not agreeable to the friends of the College, we are not informed. Since leaving there he has been pastor of a Baptist church in Bath, and is said to carry most of his people with him in his views of truth and Christian doctrine. Those views, so far as declared in the volume before us, are decidedly anti-Calvinistic, and in harmony with those usually advocated in this journal. Not that we claim Dr. Sheldon as one of ourselves. He says nothing of Unity or Trinity, and we have no means of knowing how he stands in relation to that controversy. Nor are we anxious to know. The topics here treated are far more important than the question of Christ's or God's personal essence. The only declaration we remember on that point is found in the Preface to this volume, and bears upon the whole matter of the writer's creed.

"I have no sympathy with the timidity which may deter any from an open declaration of their views, because these views may be thought to conflict with an accredited standard of Orthodoxy. Though numbering myself with the Orthodox so called, on the subject of the Divinity of our Lord, and on other subjects, I must yet disavow altogether the binding authority of any extra-Scriptural definitions and statements of Orthodoxy. The only Orthodoxy which I venerate is truth, and what may be shown to have the marks of truth. I believe that much of the received dogmatic theology needs to be searchingly re-examined and amended. What is held a fundamental truth in ethics, must not be contradicted by anything in our theological systems. . . . Our faith in Scripture would receive a fearful recoil if Scripture were found, as it is not, teaching anything in conflict with our moral judgments; for deeper than our reverence for any external revelation, underlying this reverence and the chief foundation of it, must be our reverence for God and for moral truth."

After two discourses on the "Being of God shown from his

Works," and the "Creation of Man in the Divine Image," — discourses which contain little that is original, and nothing to us objectionable, — Dr. Sheldon treats of the "Temptation and Fall," and their consequences to Adam's posterity. Those consequences he regards as wholly moral, — not physical, not penal, nor connected at all with inheritance or imputation. Adam was created as we are, and sinned as we sin; we are created as Adam was, and fall as he fell, through temptation and weakness. A difference of course there is in outward condition and moral exposure, but not a difference of nature or moral constitution. "I know of no shadow of a reason for supposing that any faculty or element was put into the constitution of Adam, which is not found now in the constitution of every living human being. Sure I am that there is not a hint in the Bible, Old Testament or New, that Adam had a single natural power or endowment which his descendants do not have." And in a further discourse on the "Threatened Death," the writer makes that death to be purely moral, having no relation to physical death, the law of mortality being a law of all organized beings, not beginning then, but existing and reigning "in the long period anterior to the creation of Adam." Not denying that the sin of the soul may affect the condition and dissolution of the body, he insists: "It is not to the credit of so many preachers and teachers of religion, that they still often speak of physical death, not only in men, but also in all animals, as the fruit of our first parents' sin; and it is time that, in this respect, a more Scriptural theology, better in harmony also with fact, with experience, and with nature, were taught."

The actual influence of Adam's disobedience on the sinfulness of his posterity, Dr. Sheldon illustrates, as Paul does, by the connection between Christ's obedience and the righteousness of the believer. Neither comes by divine decree or by transfer, or any kind of necessity. Both are alike free, moral, individual. "We are just as little made sinners without our agency, as we are restored to righteousness without our agency. Adam has just as little involved us in condemnation without our fault, as Christ delivers us from condemnation without our earnest co-operation." "Adam has exerted no irresistibly determining influence on the one side, and Christ exerts no such influence on the other side." "Too long has a large portion of the Christian Church lain under the incubus of an unsound and chilling theology in these respects. The nightmare must be thrown off, or the very lifeblood of intelligent piety will be congealed in death; and the Church, in just thinking, will fall behind the world, and be unfitted to guide it in the path of divine knowledge and understanding."

This is plain speaking, and we are glad there is here and there a man who dares to say what thousands think, but suppress from attachment to systems or fear of consequences. There is an immense amount of *concealed truth* in the religious mind of the predominant sects. In saying this, we charge no fraud, nor judge the motive. We speak only of the fact and the effect; and we fear the effect is much the same as if the concealed truth were a virtual falsehood. Why is it not a virtual falsehood, if the real conviction is just the opposite of the declared system and supposed belief? For example, David's account of himself, as "shapen in iniquity," and Paul's language, "by nature children of wrath," are still retained and repeated, in creed and the pulpit, without any explanation, and in a way to convey to the people the impression, not only that David and Paul meant to represent by them the native depravity and sinfulness of all men, but also that this is the belief of those who quote the words; whereas probably every intelligent speaker and hearer believes, as Dr. Sheldon does, that the Psalmist was only using the "earnest and hyperbolic language which deep feeling naturally prompts," and that the Apostle "has in view the degrading habits and vices common among the heathen." We have little doubt that the vast majority of the Christians of this day, (ample evidence of the fact do we find also in the writings of the early Christians,) while they hold to the doctrine of human depravity in some form, as all do, would, if they expressed themselves frankly and definitely, speak of proper "original sin" as severely as this writer does: "We reject both the idea and the term. We hold the idea to be wholly imaginary, and the term, as it has commonly been used, nonsensical. We deny the existence of any other sin than actual voluntary sin."

With equal explicitness does Dr. Sheldon give his views of the Atonement, in two discourses entitled "How Christ was made Sin," and "How Men are made Righteous by Christ." A few brief passages will show his interpretation of such language, and show likewise, as we believe, the Gospel truth. "Christ was not made sin, nor treated as a sinner, on the ground that his sufferings and death were necessary to make the exercise of the Divine mercy to men consistent with the maintenance of Divine justice. Christ did not come on earth and die for the purpose of removing an obstacle in the Divine government, in the way of extending pardon to the penitent. Where do we find a single intimation of an obstacle in the mind of God, or in the order of his government, in the way of extending forgiveness to men who turn from their sins? In what chapter and verse is it said, that this forgiveness of the penitent cannot be, unless something else, the interposition of Christ, first is?" "The

manifestation of Christ in the flesh, his teaching, example, and death for us, cannot in strictness be called an atonement, or a reconciliation; they are more properly means of effecting an atonement. Or if, in conformity with present popular usage, we lodge an objective atonement in the work of Christ, we should always be careful to explain this as consisting in the value of his work, as a means, in connection with the preaching of the Gospel, of bringing men to repentance and salvation. The value of the Gospel of Christ lies in the fact, that it is able, by the blessing of God, to work this great change in us."

In commenting upon the passage, so constantly quoted, in which Paul speaks of Christ as a "propitiation," (Rom. iii. 25,) Dr. Sheldon says: "It exhibits Christ in the light in which we have already viewed him, as the great vehicle of the Divine mercy to the believing. Certainly he was not a propitiation, in the sense that he rendered God propitious; for this would imply that he effected a change in God, which is an impossible thing. He simply declared the Divine propitiousness in conjunction with the Divine righteousness, in such a way as to recover the believing to righteousness."

Once more, in regard to retribution, we have the following: "We conclude, therefore, that there may be all sorts of degrees in the bitter recollections and self-accusing reflections of the lost, in the future world. The state of each one there will be put in correspondence with his character here. No one will suffer more than the ends of righteousness may require. No one will experience a worse doom than he will see that he has created for himself."

We have quoted thus freely from this volume, that we might do no injustice to the author. Yet we are aware that such passages, taken from the body of well-arranged discourses, cannot do full justice to any writer; and we the more earnestly commend the book to all who would see these great themes fairly discussed, and from a different point of view from that occupied by ourselves. Dr. Sheldon tells us that these opinions are not recently adopted, but have been held by him, wholly or in part, and also taught, through his whole public life. Even in the theological school he was led "to a most decisive rejection of the theories with regard to the imputation of sin and righteousness." It is pleasant to believe that such views are held and inculcated by many teachers, heard quietly and accepted by many societies, of whom we do not hear, and whose names convey no idea of the truth they hold. There may yet be found more agreement in essentials, and more independence of creed, than any have suspected.

The volume closes with two occasional discourses: one,

delivered before the New York Baptist Union, in Rochester, 1854, and differing in many of its views of " Ministerial Education " from the previous discourse of Dr. Wayland on the same occasion, to which reference is made ; the other, and last, an oration before the Literary Societies of Waterville College, last August, on " Moral Freedom," — a topic not common for such occasions, but discussed in a free, manly spirit.

Mortimer's College Life. By E. J. MAY, Author of " Louis's School Days," etc. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 16mo. pp. 344.

THIS story, like most of those which have emanated from the same source, the Evangelical section of the English Church, is marked by such opposite characteristics, that it is hard to know whether to praise or to condemn it. Its morality is pure, while its theology is harsh and narrow ; it is amiable in its bigotry, canting in its charity, affluent in its use of Scripture phrases, but most inaccurate in their application. Its hero is an excellent, though rather weak youth, who gets on and becomes eminent, more through exceeding piety than through courage or industry. The title of the story is a misnomer, since considerably less than one third of the volume is devoted to the college life of Mr. Mortimer, and of this life the details, with the exception of an evening or two of religious conversation, a dinner in the hall, and a somewhat feeble sort of " row," are next to nothing. The characters of the book, too, are so mixed up, and so carelessly drawn, that it is impossible to be interested in any of them ; and the combination of sacred and profane subjects is very odd, not to say grotesque. The tone of the religious talk is at once dogmatic and timid, positive in its assertions, but dreadfully afraid of free discussion. We are told (on p. 266) that " there are fundamental doctrines on which no true Christian can differ. The doctrine of the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity ; the full, perfect satisfaction of the sacrifice of the blood of Christ ; the entire ruin of man at the fall. There can be *no mistake* about these." These are very simple and easy doctrines. But there are " some abstruse and mysterious difficulties, which seem to constitute the whole religion of some people, and with which they not unfrequently distress and perplex the tender mind of a child of Christ." We infer from what is subsequently said, that these " abstruse and mysterious difficulties " are, whether candles ought to be burned on the altar, whether it is right for the priest to pray toward the east,

whether he ought to preach in a gown or a surplice, and the like. These are indeed distressing problems.

Mr. Mortimer has had, as he admits, but small opportunity to learn what the Bible *means*, or what *sects* specially believe, — has never really cared to *study* theology, though he has become a powerful preacher. We learn his opinion of Unitarians in a conversation which he has with Miss Fanny Salisbury, his future wife, — a young lady who resembles, in astuteness and good sense, some of her sex whom we have known nearer home. Miss Fanny does not want to be “presumptuous.” She is not troubled by the “Romanists,” for they have “no Bible at all.” Nor has she “felt any danger from Unitarians. As Dr. Arnold says, it is like touching a corpse, so cold, so lifeless, it always makes me shudder. I had a Unitarian school-fellow, poor girl ! But you know, Mr. Mortimer, a child with a Bible may upset a Unitarian or a Romanist ; and *of the two, the last is the best.*” To which profound remark the young clergyman replies : “It always seems to me that that dreadful Socinian doctrine is one that does not admit of the slightest outward fellowship. ‘Have no fellowship with works of darkness’ is the command. We are certainly too apt to be careless of God’s honor in matters of social intercourse.” The only differences which disturb this charitable divine are “differences between Bible Christians.”

The word “error” is a favorite word with writers of this school. They speak of “tinctures of error,” and *mixture* of error, as if they were religious apothecaries. “Dinner” is another favorite word. After a spicy theological argument, in which good sense is of course vanquished by “crushing texts,” the disputants usually retire to “dress for dinner.” *Death* is generally represented as an awful calamity, — a penalty for the neglect of God’s commandment. We are informed (on p. 101), that “King Asa, when diseased in his feet, sought to the physicians, and not to the Lord, and what was the sequel ? HE DIED !” In the language of this school, the condemnation which Jesus pronounced upon the wicked is “beautiful and animating.” *Antichrist* with them means Dissent in general. Fear is the approved motive, and we are to keep God’s commands “fearfully.” The fact that they belong to the *Low Church* party does not imply any abatement of aristocratic rank. There are no plebeians among the favored characters of this book. The names are high-sounding : Trevannion, Salisbury Vernon, Nevinson, Mortimer. Poor Ferrers slips out of sight, and Rev. Mr. Strangeways turns out, as might be expected, a mere malicious Calvinist, worse than a Puseyite.

But we are giving the volume, perhaps, a longer notice than it deserves, though undoubtedly its republication by a respecta-

ble New York house will give to it a wide circulation, especially among pious Calvinistic readers, who will learn from it to hate heresy with a more holy horror. The literary merits of the book are fair. Some queer expressions we have noted ; as where it is said man " is meant to progress : I feel my existencè is to mount " ; — and (on p. 149) where we are told that one of the Oxford dining-halls " was hung round with numerous portraits of benevolent founders and *great guns*." If the first chapter had been omitted, we might suppose, on beginning the second, that Mr. James had given us another novel. It is quite refreshing to meet that *solitary horseman* again on a bright, peaceful summer evening.

Religion in Common Life : a Sermon. By the REV. JOHN CAIRD, M. A., Minister of Errol. Published by Her Majesty's Command. Edinburgh and London : William Blackwood and Sons. 1855.

ONE of the amiable weaknesses of the gracious sovereign of England is a propensity to invite Dissenting preachers to the chapel of Buckingham Palace, to the great scandal of the prelates, who claim the proper charge of royalty. The Queen is evidently not quite satisfied with the decent dulness of the Established Church, and loves the freer and fresher utterances of the Scotch divines. To which school of the Scotch Church Mr. Caird belongs, we are not informed ; but his rhetoric and his doctrine are a very considerable improvement upon the diffuse and verbose homilies by which Dr. Cumming has gained his fame of pulpit eloquence. The "command" of her Majesty in this instance will be approved by discriminating readers. The truths of the discourse are wholesome and timely in a royal household, and rebuke not very gently those sins of heartlessness, formality, and empty show of religion, which are the besetting sins of aristocratic society. Mr. Caird believes that practical Christianity is *active* Christianity, and that it is a great deal better than the religion of *creed* or *ritual*. He pleads for week-day piety, not as shown in many prayers, but in purity of life and in works of charity. He drops all the technical terms of the Calvinistic pulpit, all the phraseology of salvation by plan ; and insists that a simple, constant, unwearied doing of duty, according to one's best light, is the service which God accepts. His style is chaste, clear, and eloquent, and his illustrations are always in good taste, and always to the point. We trust that he will preach many more such sermons in the high places of England, and that the same "command" will continue to follow

their delivery. If so, the reigning house of England may yet become Unitarian. We hope to see a sermon so honored in England, and so worthy of the honor, republished on this side of the water.

Lanmere. By MRS. JULIA R. C. DORR, Author of *Farmingdale*.
New York: Mason Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 447.

THIS is an interesting story; somewhat too minute in its details, perhaps, and not wrought up with remarkable power, yet unexceptionable in its moral tone and impression, which is more than can be said of some other issues of its publishers. It is especially to be commended as exhibiting the unamiable temper and unhealthy fruits of a very common form of religiousness. The "Christians" of this book are not narrow bigots or stately formalists, but are excellent, large-hearted, rational men and women, who love justice, and forgiveness, and uprightness, wherever found. Our chief objection to the book is in the poetic headings to the chapters, many of which are inapplicable, and all of which are needless. The list is rather miscellaneous. We have Shakespeare and Willis, Longfellow and Miss Sproat.

The State of the Soul between Death and the Resurrection. By
REV. PHINEAS BLAKEMAN, North Madison, Conn. New York:
M. W. Dodd. 1855. 18mo. pp. 114.

THIS little volume differs considerably in its views of the intermediate state from the imaginary revelations of the lamented John F. Lane of San Francisco, by which Judge Edmonds was so "hocussed." Its views, on the whole, are sound, rational, and agreeable. Mr. Blakeman is not, certainly, a very gifted expositor of Scripture. We cannot consent to the unquestionable force of his Bible argument for a disembodied existence, or take the conversation of Dives with Lazarus as convincing evidence that "souls" talk with each other. We cannot find in the Transfiguration, or the Apocalyptic vision, or the letters of St. Paul, surely not as Mr. Blakeman cites them, "clear and satisfactory evidence that the soul does not remain unconscious until the morning of the resurrection." But when this first feeble Scriptural chapter is despatched, the remaining chapters may be read with pleasure, as a simple statement of that which is most probable about the condition of the soul after it is separated from the body. The views are not profound or original, but they are much more sensible than the stuff which passes current

now as "spiritual" literature. We prefer the good, honest, homely utterances of Mr. Blakeman to anything that the recent prophets have told forth, or to the last announcements even of Bacon, Shakespeare, and Zoroaster, as filtered through entranced "mediums."

Selections from the Writings of WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR.
Edited by GEORGE STILLMAN HILLARD. Boston: Ticknor
and Fields. 1856. 16mo. pp. 308.

MR. HILLARD has rendered a real service to every lover of polite literature by the preparation of this volume. Under appropriate titles, he has collected in a compact and elegant form some of the many striking thoughts which are scattered through the voluminous writings of this profound and original thinker. For such a task few persons possess higher qualifications than Mr. Hillard. His ripe and varied culture, his intimate acquaintance with English literature, and his exquisite taste in all literary matters, are a sufficient guaranty that the task would be discharged with fidelity and good judgment. To these most necessary qualifications of an editor, he joins, moreover, a hearty respect and admiration for his author; and the volume not only exhibits marks of his excellent taste in all the selections, but it also affords abundant evidence that its preparation has been a work of love. The different selections, as we have intimated, are distributed under different titles, — Politics and Government; Literature and Criticism; Love, Friendship, and the Domestic Affections; and Miscellaneous. And reference to them is still further facilitated by the addition of a carefully prepared Index. Indeed, the editor seems to have neglected no effort to make the selections worthy of his author and of his own reputation. The admirable discrimination displayed in the choice and arrangement of the different passages, and the faultless beauty of its typography, must commend the volume to the most fastidious judges of books.

Landor is generally admitted to be one of the most profound and thoughtful writers of the age; but there is something repellent in his productions to a large class of persons. With many passages of splendid eloquence, which must move the most sluggish readers, it is to be regretted that his style should so often become dry, hard, and uninviting. With such large and liberal views on many topics, it is even more to be regretted that he should so often be swayed by his prejudices. The form which he has chosen to give to a considerable portion of his works is also one which is open to weighty objections, and is not upon the

whole attractive. A scholar and a recluse, Mr. Landor has not sought to give to his writings a popular form, to polish his style, or to subdue his prejudices. It was therefore especially necessary in his case that some competent person should do precisely what Mr. Hillard has here accomplished, in a manner which must for ever render any further selection from Landor superfluous, except in the way of additions to this volume. The result of his labors will be to open to public appreciation the rich treasures of a writer who never could become popular through his own books.

Patriarchy; or, The Family: its Constitution and Probation.

By JOHN HARRIS, D. D., President of New College, London, and Author of "Pre-Adamite Earth," etc., etc. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. New York: Sheldon, Lamport, and Blakeman. 1855.

DR. HARRIS is very widely and very favorably known as an able, judicious, and earnest writer upon religious and ethical themes in their relations to modern science as well as to practical life. The present work is moderate and truly Catholic in its theological statements, and full of sound common sense, though we cannot claim for it any brilliancies of style or illustration. It seems to us, moreover, that the author would have gained directness and point, besides something in the crowning merit of brevity, had he suffered the patriarchs of whom we know so very little to rest in the obscurity to which Providence has consigned them, and confined himself to a discussion of the family as it exists in the world at this time. After all, what advantage is there in trying to make out a patriarchal dispensation as a distinct method of Providence with the human race? We have only the most meagre materials for any such undertaking. Nevertheless, for a large class of readers this plan of the work may add greatly to its value and attractiveness, and at all events it can do no harm.

Christian Theism: the Testimony of Reason and Revelation to the Existence and Character of the Supreme Being. By ROBERT ANCHOR THOMPSON, M. A. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1855. 12mo. pp. 477.

WHEN a man comes to us strong in faith, testifying to a vision of God with the eye of the soul, it is good to listen, even though he may not be one of the wisest and mightiest; but when a

man comes reasoning, arguing about God, endeavoring to add to our faith knowledge, we do not care to hear him unless his thoughts are of the largest and deepest. We are always fearful lest the great fundamental article of faith, without which the world must suffer wreck, may be confounded with the arguments about this article, which may be overthrown and drag down nothing with them. Books of natural theology, except so far as they contain striking and pleasant illustrations from the vast storehouse of creation, are for the most part very dull, and, as it seems to us, unprofitable reading. We do not know that "Christian Theism" is any less interesting than its predecessors in the same line, but we are certain that it is not any more so, and although it is by no means a book devoid of merit, we cannot regard it as likely to leave any mark upon the mind of our time, or to convert a single Atheist or Deist. We wonder that the learned judges could find it deserving of the famous Burnett Prize.

Life of George Washington. By WASHINGTON IRVING. Vol. II. New York : G. P. Putnam & Co. 1855. 8vo. pp. 518. Boston : Frederick Parker, Cornhill, Agent.

WE wait for the yet remaining volume of this long expected and heartily welcomed work before indulging ourselves in that extended estimate and criticism of it which its prominent place in our literature may well demand. The spontaneous and universal judgment of all classes in our community who concern themselves with such themes is, that Washington Irving was the proper man to write a popular biography of George Washington. And the highest expectation which this acclaim would have indicated as setting the standard of excellence in the work to be done, has been gratefully acknowledged to have been realized. Nor has there been any forgetfulness of our prior obligations to Mr. Sparks. His voluminous and thorough work will never be superseded, except it may be in some possible work of larger and fuller compass, which shall swallow it up and appropriate all his pioneer toil, and avail itself of the incidental lights which his research and his method have brought to bear on his subject. But it is not to be denied that Mr. Irving's pen is most facile in just such composition and detail and description as are most requisite in the relation of at least three fifths of all that is to be told concerning Washington. His charming style, the graces of his spirit, the undertone of sentiment, the delicacy with which censure is conveyed, and the quiet humor which gleams here and there, as a set-off to the dignity and precision of most of the narrative, must win the delighted interest of every reader.

The volume before us covers only one year and a half of the lifetime of its subject. But what a crowded and momentous space of his existence it was! From the summer of 1775 to the close of 1776 constitutes the period. It opens with the signal event — and yet what event was not a signal one in the life of that man? — of Washington's taking the command of the American troops at Cambridge, and relates the vexations and discouragements under which he, whom the Congress had made a General, proceeded to make for himself an army. New men, men of subsequent renown, and men not destined to the purest fame in their country's story, now come upon the scene, and Mr. Irving has to introduce them to his readers with such comments as his own calm judgment of them dictates. Stirring events, dark and bright, now plunging the bold hope of a perilled cause into almost rayless darkness, now flashing with an inspiring confidence upon the hearts of patriots, have to be narrated. Guiding and improving them all, — we would say *overruling* them, did not that word stand consecrated to the Providence above, — Washington in his noble simplicity and his lofty purity of soul comes before us; and everything that is told us of his purposes or of his methods exalts our thought of him. Will not Mr. Irving need at least two more volumes, to insure the symmetrical completion of his elegant work?

A First-Class Reader; consisting of Extracts, in Prose and Verse, with Biographical and Critical Notices of the Authors. For the Use of Advanced Classes in Public and Private Schools. By G. S. HILLARD. Boston: Hickling, Swan, and Brown. 1856. 12mo. pp. 504.

THIS volume, as its title indicates, has been prepared with a special reference to its use as a school-book; and as such it fully meets all the requirements for the class of books to which it belongs. But it may also be regarded as a collection of elegant extracts, which will be read with pleasure by persons of mature years. Nor is it easy to determine under which aspect it should be regarded with the more favor. Mr. Hillard's familiarity with our best literature has enabled him to bring together a body of selections from our elder and our more recent authors, most of which have never before appeared in a similar compilation. To the selections from each writer he has prefixed a brief biographical and critical notice, giving the leading facts in the author's life, with some judicious remarks on his principal works. These notices are written with great judgment and taste, and are models of graceful composition. They constitute one of the

most pleasing features in the volume ; and every person who takes it up for an hour's reading will feel grateful to Mr. Hillard for the labor bestowed on them. In order to adapt the compilation to the use for which it was intended, occasional omissions have been made, and words have been sometimes changed in the pieces selected. These omissions and changes have been made with great discrimination ; and no one who is familiar with English literature will doubt the necessity of such a revision, even of the writings of the most celebrated authors. The selections number more than one hundred and fifty pieces, drawn from nearly as many different writers, and are judiciously arranged according to their subjects, and in a progressive order. Among the authors are many of the most distinguished writers in our language.

Cyclopædia of American Literature ; embracing Personal and Critical Notices of Authors, and Selections from their Writings, from the Earliest Period to the Present Day : with Portraits, Autographs, and other Illustrations. By EVERT A. DUYKINCK and GEORGE L. DUYKINCK. New York : Charles Scribner. 1855. Two vols. Royal 8vo. pp. 676, 781.

THE editors of this laborious work are eminently deserving of the gratitude of that extended multitude of readers for whose instruction they have so conscientiously completed an undertaking which but very few persons would have ventured even to propose. However much or little of assistance the Messrs. Duykinck may have had in the details of their work, the whole credit of it belongs to them. Of course they have had to rely much upon the suggestions and the help of others, even in many cases to the extent of accepting, and to a degree indorsing, the opinions and the judgments passed upon some of the authors included in their volumes. If perfection be taken as the standard for deciding upon the merits of the work, it would not endure the test. Complaints will doubtless be raised in some circles, that men and women who were and are eminently deserving of extended notice in it are not even mentioned by name. This complaint, too, may be urged in consistency with the avowed condition of the comprehensive method of the work, which was to include all American authors who had produced one or more books. The names of several persons who have written some of the most valuable books in our literature occur to us, for which we look in vain. None but sour critics will charge that the editors have intentionally omitted such as these, for the sake of having room left to rescue from oblivion, or to attempt hopelessly to force into notice, authors whose title-pages are their own

gravestones. The editors are above any such miserable motive. Whether they have too softly yielded to the solicitations of others leading them in this direction, we cannot positively affirm, but we should think it likely, and should rather lay it to the account of their liberality and generosity of purpose, than refer it to any bias or partiality. Then, too, the epithets used to convey criticisms, to mete out praise, or to apportion judgment, whether employed by the editors or by their contributors, often touch upon very delicate ground. Numerous mistakes in dates and matters of fact were to be expected; we have found such, and rather wonder that there are no more. With all these abatements, we still pronounce upon the work a high encomium. It had to traverse a wide field of exploration, as a pioneer, doing a vast deal of dry, uninviting, and tasteless work. Some persons will prize most its memorials of the long dead, while others will prefer its records of the living or of the recently departed. It is a noble monument of zeal, industry, and devotion to the interests of literature. Its faults and defects are comparatively trifling, easy of remedy in a new and revised edition. Its commendable qualities are numerous and of a high order. Detraction may find in it ready materials for its exercise, but generous critics will extend to the editors a grateful approbation.

Memoir of THOMAS HANDASYD PERKINS; containing Extracts from his Diaries and Letters. With an Appendix. By THOMAS G. CARY. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1855. 8vo. pp. 304.

THAT noble-souled man, whose image as he walked in life is vividly brought before us in the striking portrait which serves as a frontispiece to this volume, has found an appropriate memorial in these pages. Mr. Cary has given us what may be called, emphatically, the biography of a merchant of the first and highest class. Written in the best taste and style for such a composition, all its contents are conformed to the sort of character and life which it is designed to portray. With but a brief reference — which we wish had been fuller — to the early years of Mr. Perkins, the Memoir proceeds to take us through his career in middle life, as with an enterprise, a wisdom, and an integrity of equally marked prominence in his character he laid the foundations for a fortune for himself, and for a hundred others. Mr. Perkins voyaged and travelled largely, at a period when so wide a wanderer was thrown on his own resources far more than he is now, depending upon his own judgment, his own ingenuity and schemes for opening avenues to profitable commerce. His

residence in France, at a time of intense interest in political and social life, found him a wise observer of what was passing before him. His journal and letters make records of several very interesting facts, which do not enter into our histories. His remarkable benevolence and generosity, of which his fellow-citizens have so many striking evidences, were manifested in his life abroad, one very touching evidence of which will engage the feelings of the reader as he peruses the story of the Conscript of Morlaix. If Boston has been favored with such a number of honored and princely merchants of the old school, who were trained without the aid and excitement furnished by memoirs of their predecessors, what sort of a race ought the city now to produce, with Appleton, Lawrence, and Perkins for their examples?

Six Sermons. By GEORGE F. SIMMONS. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe & Co. 1856. pp. 134. 12mo.

HERE are six sermons upon Omnipresence, Word made Flesh, The Holy Spirit, Pure Religion, Christ in the Storm, and Humility. Five of them were prepared by the writer for the press, as the wasting hand of sickness laid him down on the bed of death; the other was added after his lamented decease, to promote variety, we suppose, and prompt us, as it does, to desire many more. Each of these farewell words justifies the most earnest view of Mr. Simmons's ability, and explains at the same time the secret of his seeming failure.

In the Preface he says, "Though these are public discourses, they are in fact my own sincerest private meditations on some of the great mysteries of existence"; and in the close, "If they warm your soul as they have glowed in my own, accept the gift; if not, put up the book with a smile of charity, not with ridicule or reproof, of which I have no fear."

A better key than these introductory sayings could not be given to a book or a character. More original meditations we have found nowhere: each discourse, even that upon the hackneyed subject of Humility, is wholly peculiar; even if the main thread is not, as in the sermon on the First of John, one which no other hand would have twisted into a pulpit address, yet the current of thought is novel, as in the argument for spiritual influences; or the applications have an entire freshness, as in the topic which closes the too brief volume, upon the text, "Whoever shall humble himself shall be exalted."

The twofold judgment which almost every sympathizing reader will involuntarily pass serves as a test of the friendly notices taken in this and other journals of this somewhat re-

markable life, whose "*In memoriam*" is this small but precious book. The second discourse will be read again and again, so as, if possible, to grasp the singular conception given of the Logos, which is used, according to Mr. Simmons, "not as an element of philosophical speculation, but in the meditateness of a mystic piety, which makes the Gospel occasionally abstruse, and invests the language of the text as it were with a heavenly mist." Yet, when repeated reading leaves one a little uncertain as to his reception of the preacher's thought, it is only too evident that, preached to a miscellaneous audience, even with the most beautiful intonation and the most engaging address, it must have failed of effect. The sermon on the Spirit, which to some would appear quite orthodox, and to others entirely transcendental, labors under the same difficulty; while the closing portion is alike practical and beautiful, the body of thought eludes one's grasp and blinds the common eye with a golden mist. It is evidently the preacher's secret musing, breathed from his own quickened bosom into those only which the Divine hand has attuned to a like melody, — an appropriate parting gift to all who cherish his memory, but not a stirring appeal to our materialistic society and our outlying life.

As we welcome this parting "gift" among our literary treasures, and rejoice to think it will find its cheering way to many a kindred spirit, it is with a mingled sentiment of sadness and joy. The Liberal pulpit of our country has often had to rejoice, even if with trembling, over its chartered freedom, honesty, and bravery of utterance, — has possessed its confessors, almost martyrs, — has been adorned by men of original talent, who forgot the favor and the frown of men so they might declare the whole counsel of God. Still, there is a feeling we cannot escape of sadness over a life closed so early, with so little marked results, with expectations of friends not half fulfilled, and visions of influence hardly begun to be realized. Yet such is earth.

Physical Geography. By R. M. ZORNLIN. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe & Co. 1855. 16mo. pp. 176.

THIS is a valuable manual upon a most interesting subject. Next to the soul and its encasement, the body, nothing perhaps is more calculated to interest than this earth, upon which that body finds its habitation and its home. Descriptive Geography treats of the earth in all its aspects, its atmosphere and winds, its surface of land and water, its volcanoes and internal fires, its climates, its races of men, its animals and plants. It deals with

every physical science ; and intimate acquaintance with its details implies extensive scientific attainment. To master such a subject requires a degree of leisure, and a love of study, which fall to the lot of but few. We are, therefore, especially grateful to those who embody the practical results of such study for popular use.

Such is the little compend of Mrs. Zornlin, a writer well known in Europe for her labors in this direction. It is well adapted for the use of schools, and also for private reference. It is a comprehensive digest of each science that pertains to the materials, forms, and inhabitants of the earth's surface ; with just sufficient of detail to impress prominent facts and results upon the mind. As a book it is highly suggestive, exciting an interest which prompts to further researches in other larger and kindred works. At the same time, we return from such researches with renewed satisfaction at the completeness and thoroughness with which we find the results of more extended studies here condensed, and embodied for reference and use.

As a school-book, it requires, perhaps, from the teacher, additional explanation and illustration. But such ought to be, to some extent, the character of a school manual. No book should obviate the necessity of all labor and explanation. If, as a text-book, it excite attention, and rouse curiosity, — if it lead the pupil to question and inquire, — it answers the great end of all teaching. Too happy will the well-qualified instructor be to impart the necessary additional information ; and, if not competent, only too grateful for a manual to direct his own researches.

The book is well got up, in compact shape, upon good paper, and with clear type. It is more firmly bound, too, than most school-books of our times, and seems well calculated to stand the wear and tear of school use.

Sermons : chiefly Occasional. By CHARLES LOWELL, Senior Minister of the West Church in Boston. Boston : Ticknor and Fields. 1855. 12mo. pp. 329.

THE vehicles for imparting "religious intelligence" have made a record of services commemorative of the completion of a half-century's pastorate by the venerated author of these *Sermons*. We enter into no criticism of them. They are characteristic of their author ; and that is giving them character enough to those who know him. *Sermons* are not the only contents of this volume. More than half of them are accompanied by appendices which give us much valuable historical, anti-

quarian, and biographical information. The West Church is, of course, the central object around which such information is gathered, though the writer has a fond regard for this department of a scholar's lore as concerns all churches and all denominations of Christians. But we had better stop; as in the very last sentence written we have transgressed against the doctrine of one of these excellent Sermons, which is, that the name Christian should be the only denomination of those who desire or are worthy to bear that.

The Communion Sabbath. By NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D. Boston : John P. Jewett & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 208.

WE should be sorry to have to avow that the occasional obtrusion in this volume of phrases and sentences ascribing to Christ "the honor which belongeth to God only" could detract from our otherwise high appreciation of its singularly refined and devout spirit. We have read it to our profit and to our best edification. Its themes are such as are appropriate to the preparation of thought and spirit for partaking in the Lord's Supper, for the occupation of mind and heart during the service, and for fixing its impressions for subsequent influence over the life; while at the same time the subjects which are presented in the volume, and the mode of their treatment, are eminently suited to touch the affections, or to rebuke the indifference, or to quicken the consciences, of those who turn away from the Saviour's invitation. The style of the volume is chaste and beautiful, simple and fervent. Dr. Adams makes us realize anew the wealth of Scripture in its suggestiveness of fresh thought, and in those unexhausted riches of truth, of sentiment, and of wisdom which freshen every sacred lesson that is to be taught on the authority of the Word. We find on the same page of this volume apothegms of condensed wisdom, illustrations of singular aptness and beauty, and stirring appeals which at once arouse the latent forces of the heart. There is tenderness, earnestness, and marked intellectual power, according as the varying relations of the subject make them suited to the tone of the address, moment by moment. The whole intent and effect of the volume is to make Christ precious to the believer, and none the less so to one who believes Christ to have received his gifts and graces from the Father, instead of holding to the unscriptural view always implied and often asserted by Dr. Adams, that what the Bible says of Christ it says of God.

Glances and Glimpses ; or Fifty Years' Social, including Twenty Years' Professional Life. By HARRIOT K. HUNT, M. D.
Boston : John P. Jewett & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 418.

WE read the first three quarters of this volume with a pleasant interest, and with the most consenting sympathy with the writer of it. Her description of her childhood, education, and experiences in the happy family life, and of her neighborly relations at the "North End" of Boston, some forty years ago, is evidently truthful, and therefore engaging. The story of family reverses and struggles, of her own noble efforts, and of the consequent happiness which followed, is told with delightful simplicity, and quickens answering sentiments of esteem in the heart of her reader. The illness of her sister, the experiments of the sick-chamber, and the secondary trials incident to a long and unsuccessful course of medical treatment, are related in a way to facilitate our readiness to recognize a healing mission and a healing gift in women. Indeed, there is nothing new, in spite of the startled tone in which offended conservatism often declaims against it as an innovation, in the assertion of the peculiar fitness of women for some of the functions of the medical profession to their own sex. In the Middle Ages it would seem that at least four fifths of all such requisite service was performed by females. The confusion of sex and grammar in the phrase which designates "a man midwife," is a striking token that men, not women, have been the trespassers out of their own province, and the intruders upon the province of the other sex. The famous Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, who made such strife in our infant Colony by her theological teachings, had previously been known and highly approved here as "a helpful woman," in the very work which Miss Dr. Hunt now claims for her sex. We are pleased, too, to note her good sense, sound judgment, and entire freedom from all sweeping, indiscriminate censoriousness against the medical profession as now practised. We sympathize with all that she writes, till she comes to involve herself with some of the questionable views of the Woman's Rights party. There we leave her, and, if we do not mistake, her own clear, good sense, and her excellent judgment and practical wisdom, will sooner or later draw her off from the fellowship of those females who would amount to a sore nuisance if there were not, happily, so few of them. We assure our readers, male and female, that the book before us is well worthy of their perusal. We have heard much in commendation of the writer, and, with the single exception above referred to, we like her ourselves, though we never saw her, and know her only by repute and by this volume.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

MESSRS. LITTLE, BROWN, & Co. are fulfilling their promise of issuing a series of volumes embracing "The British Essayists." With a most competent editor, whose able and thorough culture enables him to furnish such introductory memoirs and such illustrative notes as are requisite for the information of the reader, we feel that we are justified in pronouncing this to be the most desirable edition of these pleasing productions that has ever been undertaken. Beginning with *The Tatler*, in four volumes, we now have *The Spectator*, in eight. The volumes are of the most convenient size for the use for which they are designed, as travelling companions, or as suited to a fireside use when one wishes to hold a book without the aid of the table, and therefore prefers a small one. It is usual to commend *The Spectator* to a new generation, on the ground of its good English style, the purity of its language, and the felicitous construction of its sentences. Of course we do not question this well-established advice of those best authorized to give advice. And yet we would not recommend a close imitation of this style, for we should not desire to have a new school of writers confined to it. It has its marked excellences, but its risks are of formality, stateliness, and sameness. We would commend these *Essays* to a new generation of readers equally on other grounds, and would commend them highly. They inculcate wise and good lessons; their spirit is generous and large; they embody the forms and manners of a past age; they are classical in their contents, and moral and religious in their whole influence.

A reliable volume on India, offering us authentic information within a reasonable compass, has long been a desideratum with a multitude of inquirers. There was no getting at the desired knowledge through the works of native authors, and the abundant works on the subject which have been written by Englishmen are naturally supposed to have been more or less impaired as to the value and reliability of their contents, either by a spirit of partiality or a spirit of hostility to that gigantic monopoly, *The East India Company*. Messrs. John P. Jewett & Co. have recently published (8vo, pp. 618) a very valuable book on *Ancient and Modern India*, by Rev. Dr. David O. Allen. The author, who has returned to this country after spending more than a quarter of a century in that land as a missionary, was well qualified to judge what sort of information we most wish, and how to communicate in an intelligible and interesting way what he has had the best means of acquiring. His work embraces particulars of the natural history of India, of its civil and religious history during the Hindoo and Mohammedan periods respectively, and of the first connection of European powers with the country. The government established there by Great Britain, a sketch of the origin and administration of the *East India Company*, an account of the foreign, native, and mixed population, and a history,

entering into the details of success and failure of the missionary enterprise there, complete the contents of this valuable volume.

Messrs. D. Appleton & Co. have published (2 vols., 12mo, pp. 388, 372) a translation of "The Confidential Correspondence of Napoleon Bonaparte with his Brother Joseph, sometime King of Spain." The letters commence in 1795, and extend through the twenty following years. Their contents are most interesting as revelations of the character of the writer, and as exposing some family feelings and family secrets in their connection with public events. There are materials in them which may be used for confirming the most extreme differences of opinion which are entertained by the admirers or the haters of Bonaparte, and they are likely henceforward to be the staple for the formation and authentication of judgments in either direction.

The same publishers have issued, as a translation from the German, an attractive volume of gossip, scandal, and useful information, entitled "The Attaché in Madrid; or, Sketches of the Court of Isabella II." (12mo, pp. 368.) We are reading it with faith in its truthfulness, which we have no reason to doubt, except in regard to its being a translation from the German, and we find it to be very interesting.

Messrs. Whittemore, Niles, and Hall have republished an exceedingly pleasant book by a French author, Edmond About, entitled "Tolla, a Tale of Modern Rome." (16mo, pp. 320.) The work has caused considerable excitement and much discussion abroad, some of the reasons of which a reader will discover by perusing the volume.

Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co. have published, in the style and size of their edition of *The British Essayists*, a beautiful volume containing Lord Bacon's *Essays* (pp. 360). We understand that the Rev. Dr. Lunt, of Quincy, is its editor. From various biographical sources, he has digested a new *Memoir of the Chancellor*, and has selected a body of excellent notes.

Redfield, of New York, has republished, (12mo, pp. 353,) the *Shakespeare Papers of the late William Maginn, LL. D.*, edited by Dr. Shelton Mackenzie. These Papers originally appeared in *Bentley's Miscellany*, and in *Fraser's Magazine*. There is keen penetration and a spirit of racy vigor, as well as much plain common-sense suggestion, in these articles. They work to good purpose a mine which is not yet exhausted.

Mr. F. A. Brown, of Hartford, has published (12mo, pp. 230,) the "Life of Captain Nathan Hale, the Martyr-Spy of the American Revolution," by I. W. Stuart. The subject of this interesting memoir has waited long for a well-deserved tribute from the pen of a biographer. Readers, old and young, will peruse the volume with a painful interest, and with a grateful homage to this devoted patriot.

Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. are about to republish the work of Rev. B. Jowett, of Oxford University, on the *Epistles of St. Paul*, a work of thorough scholarship, and of a most significant liberality of sentiment.

which we have no reason to doubt, except in regard to its being a translation from the German, and we find it to be very interesting.

Messrs. Whittemore, Niles, and Hall have republished an exceedingly pleasant book by a French author, Edmond About, entitled "Tolla, a Tale of Modern Rome." (16mo, pp. 320.) The work has caused considerable excitement and much discussion abroad, some of the

which we have no reason to doubt, except in regard to its being a translation from the German, and we find it to be very interesting.

Messrs. Whittemore, Niles, and Hall have republished an exceedingly pleasant book by a French author, Edmond About, entitled "Tolla, a Tale of Modern Rome." (16mo, pp. 320.) The work has caused considerable excitement and much discussion abroad, some of the reasons of which a reader will discover by perusing the volume.

Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co. have published, in the style and size of their edition of *The British Essayists*, a beautiful volume containing Lord Bacon's *Essays* (pp. 360). We understand that the Rev. Dr. Lunt, of Quincy, is its editor. From various biographical sources, he has digested a new *Memoir of the Chancellor*, and has selected a body of excellent notes.

Redfield, of New York, has republished, (12mo, pp. 353,) the *Shakespeare Papers of the late William Maginn, LL. D.*, edited by Dr. Shelton Mackenzie. These Papers originally appeared in *Bentley's Miscellany*, and in *Fraser's Magazine*. There is keen penetration and a spirit of racy vigor, as well as much plain common-sense suggestion, in these articles. They work to good purpose a mine which is not yet exhausted.

Mr. F. A. Brown, of Hartford, has published (12mo, pp. 230,) the "Life of Captain Nathan Hale, the Martyr-Spy of the American Revolution," by I. W. Stuart. The subject of this interesting memoir has waited long for a well-deserved tribute from the pen of a biographer. Readers, old and young, will peruse the volume with a painful interest, and with a grateful homage to this devoted patriot.

Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. are about to republish the work of Rev. B. Jowett, of Oxford University, on the *Epistles of St. Paul*, a work of thorough scholarship, and of a most significant liberality of sentiment.